

194

AN INTENSIVE STUDY OF THE SEPARATE NEGRO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
OF HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS IN TRANSITION
TO SINGLE, INTEGRATED SYSTEMS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

BY
TOMMY LEE WALTON

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AUGUST, 1966

R: i-vii
P: 99

1963-12

DEDICATION

To

My Loving Children

Trent and Sheila

T. L. W.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Altogether, some twenty men and women have cooperated in producing the final copy of this thesis, largely because of their faith in the enduring achievements of education and their hope for its future. It is in their name that I offer AN INTENSIVE STUDY OF THE SEPARATE NEGRO SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS IN TRANSITION TO SINGLE, INTEGRATED SYSTEMS to my professional colleagues and to the growing number of laymen who appreciate their stake in modern education.

I am grateful to the members of my Advisory Board, without whose counsel and guidance the task would have been appreciably more difficult, if not altogether impossible. They have given generously of their time and have helped at every stage from the preparation of the tentative outline to the reviewing of the final topics. Their influence can be seen throughout the volume.

I am especially indebted to Dr. Laurence E. Boyd who worked, untiringly, throughout the research period. Even in the midst of an over-loaded schedule, he cooperated whole-heartedly and showed eagerness to help get the job done under the severe limitations of time.

A vote of thanks is due my wife, Earnestine, who kept both moral and financial support flowing throughout the research period - the greatest period of my life.

It is with deep gratitude that the writer acknowledges the helpful suggestions which have come from the investigations and the writings of other professional workers in education. It would be an act of ingratitude to overlook the courtesies of authors and publishers who have consented to the use of quoted materials. Complete reference is made in the text at each point where published or unpublished materials have been used.

T. L. W.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vii

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Rationale	1
	Evolution of the Problem.	3
	Contribution to Educational Research.	3
	Statement of the Problem.	3
	Purpose of the Study.	3
	Definition of Terms	5
	Limitations of the Study.	5
	Locale of the Study	6
	Methods of Educational Research	6
	Period of the Study	6
	Subjects and Materials.	6
	Operational or Procedural Steps	7
	Survey of Related Literature.	8
	Summary of Related Literature	11
II.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	13
	Frame-of-Reference.	13
	Introductory Statement.	16
	General Nature of the Problem	17
	Areas for Sources of Data	18
	Historical Background of Problem.	19
	Founding of the Separate Negro School Dis- tricts	19
	Fiscal Structure.	21
	Board of Education.	22
	Patterns of the Segregated Systems.	24
	School Finance.	26
	Facilities.	28
	School Personnel.	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
II.	
Tuition.	31
Transportation and Consolidation	32
Instructional Materials.	33
School Attendance.	35
Curricula.	35
School Accreditation	37
Impact of the 1964 Civil Rights Ruling	38
Emergent Guidelines.	38
The Initial Desegregation Suit	41
Districts No. 1 and 39 as Defendants. . . .	42
Petition Asks School Consolidation.	43
Statement of Facts and Conclusions of Law .	45
Districts No. 11, 38, and 3 as Defendants .	48
Nashville News Explains Intervention	50
The Early Court Decision	52
Order	53
Court-Suggested Plans for Implementation . . .	55
Gazette Explains District 39's Plan.	61
The Emergence of Controversial Issues in	
Local Implementations	62
Current Implementation	64
Report of Desegregation's Impact on Nashville .	65
Impending Suits and the Help of Professional	
Organizations	67
Desegregation of Administrative Structure. . .	68
A Programmed Look into Integration	68
Summary.	
III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	70
Recapitulation of the Theoretical Basis of	
the Study	70
Frame-of-Reference.	70
Recapitulation of the Research-Design.	72
Summary of Related Literature.	74
Summary of the Basic Findings.	76
Conclusions.	79
Implications	80
Recommendations.	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82
APPENDICES	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Appendix A - Notice.	87
B - Choice Form	89
C - Summary Data on the Educational Program . . .	91
D - School Board Members.	95
E - Questionnaire for Parents	97
VITA.	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Ratio of Population in Howard County - 1960.	20
2.	Mill Ratio Tax - Howard County, Arkansas	23
3.	ESEA Allocation of Funds - Fiscal Year 1966.	34
4.	Average Daily Attendance - Howard County, Arkansas .	36
5.	Summary Data of the Fiscal Support on the Educa- tional Program - Howard County, Arkansas	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale.--In eliminating the evils of segregation and the social and educational disadvantages which accompany it, the school districts of this era must accept a leadership role in removing the barriers which prevent educationally deprived children, irrespective of their race, ethnic background, or socio-economic status, from full access to the educational opportunities provided at public expense. Equally as important, the Federal Government in support of the recently revised guidelines must weed out the local failures and make it clear that the purpose of a desegregation plan is to bring about desegregation and that desegregation plans will be judged on their actual results, not merely on paper compliance.

The purposes of education tell of the important role public schools play in our democracy. Our public schools have served the nation well. Never before in the history of the world have so many been educated. Individuals have prospered and our nation has achieved greatness. This greatness, for the most part, has come about because of the provisions made by the Federal Government and the people of the State. These two forces are responsible for the existence of school districts all over the United States whose ultimate aim is to provide better education for all.

Then, if this is true, school districts must provide means devised to attain the ends that will enable public schools to continue to add to the well-being of every individual of the nation. Yes, there is considerable evidence to support the contention that the school district is a vital organ in our democracy. David S. Seeley, assistant commissioner, Educational Opportunities Program, U. S. O. E., said:

The most state and federal authorities can do, whether they be judicial or executive, is require that the law be adhered to. No one who has worked on school desegregation could possibly do anything but applaud a greater sense of initiative and responsibility on the part of local school officials in this area. But no one at any time, at any level of government or in any society based on law will applaud local control used to evade the requirements of law and deny children their right to equal treatment under those laws.¹

However inspiring purposes may be, they are not self-executing. Many school districts pantomime varied practices which are unfair and unjust to the minority group and does not, in any way, portray the creatures of the state as so often called.

Too often school districts tend to deny some of its subjects the opportunities as layed out and intended by the Federal Government. Poorly selected, overworked and underpaid staffs, shabby buildings, and inadequate instructional supplies are commonly found throughout the south.

In some areas of the South, separate Negro School Districts are found existing within another school district. In Negro School

¹David S. Seeley, "Seeley Responds: Local Failures Forced the Guidelines," Nation's Schools, LXXVII, No. 6 (June, 1966), p. 104.

Districts of this type, honest efforts are made to improve learning; however, the financial structure of the districts usually limit the implementation of a sound educational program. In areas where this type of situation is prevalent, the pre-existing school districts are satisfied with this act of gerrymander and make every attempt to resist compliance. Conditions of this type must be eliminated and are presently being broken down by the Government. It must be realized that no one at any level of government or in any society based on law can deny children their right to equal treatment under those laws.

Evolution of the problem.---The problem involved in this study stems from a deep interest in and the uniqueness of the separate Negro School Districts in Howard County, Arkansas and the great lag that this existence has caused in education for the youth of this attendance area.

Contribution to educational research.---It is hoped, by the writer, that this study will point out the significance of school district reorganization and to illustrate the kind and quality of leadership so particularly important in providing continuous improvement of education and civilization in the new democratic society.

Statement of the problem.---The major problem involved in this study will be: To trace the course and development of two Negro school districts in Howard County, Arkansas during transition to a single and integrated school district, in each situation, as prompted by the 1964 Civil Rights Act and following civil rights legislation.

Purpose of the study.---The purpose of this study is to give a

portrayal of the administrative problems and approaches used in converting a former separate Negro school district into a single, integrated school district as dictated by the Federal Government.

The purpose of this study is more clearly understood and more specifically stated below:

1. To portray the original structure of the school district prior to the initial effort for dissolution into a single and integrated school district.
2. To determine the actual events leading up to the inception of the problem of desegregating school districts at the administrative level.
3. To determine how the Civil Acts prompted the change from separate White and Negro school districts and superintendency to a single district and a single superintendency.
4. To characterize what measures the Negro District used to promote this transition and what defensive measures were used by the pre-existing district to sustain opposition.
5. To explore the nature and scope of the legal activities connected with the trend toward integration of the school districts and superintendency.
6. To identify major areas of concern that were affected by the court decisions, such as:
 - a. The fiscal support of the school districts
 - b. The resistance of the White citizenry
 - c. The fears of the Negro citizenry
 - d. The apprehension of the Negro educational personnel
7. To clearly delineate the major problems confronting the schools, administration and community that grew out of the final court decision.
8. To analyze and interpret the scope of the case for the plaintiffs and the Federal Intervention of which re-defined the guidelines for integrating the school districts.
9. To examine the modes of implementing the orientation

program for students occasioned with district consolidation and school desegregation.

10. To reveal and characterize the techniques in the integrating of Negro and White School District structures which will provide guidance for school districts in future involvement.

Definition of terms.--Due to the legal nature of this study and for the purposes of clarity, significant terms used throughout this study are listed below:

1. "Attendance Area" - An attendance area is that part of a school district whose population is served in part at least by a single school.¹
2. "Brief" - A lawyer's short statement or legal outline of the argument for or against a case.
3. "Compliance" - Compliance is the act or state of yielding or consenting to a ruling.²
4. "Plaintiff" - One who begins a suit in court.
5. "Plaintiff-Intervenor" - One who follows up or adds to complaints of the initial suit in court.
6. "School District" - A prescribed geographical school area which is autonomous in its administrative and, usually, fiscal affairs.
7. "Statutes" - An ordinance or law passed by a duly authorized lawmaking body.³

Limitations of the study.--Extensive research materials and varied sources are available for reference in this study; however, only material relevant to this particular study was utilized. It is hoped that the

¹ Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration, Concepts, Practices and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1959), p. 214.

² The Winston Dictionary, College Edition (The John C. Winston Company, Atlanta, Georgia, 1951), p. 195.

³ Ibid., p. 971.

survey and analysis uncovered the fact that some members of the community gave false responses in fear that they might suffer personal persecution.

Locale of the study.--The greater part of this study was undertaken in Nashville, Howard County, Arkansas. Nashville, the County Seat, is situated in the southwest section of Arkansas and occupies a total of 253 square miles, against 1,063 square miles for the entire County. The total population of the County is 10,878, including 2,260 Negroes. The total number of students enrolled in public schools is 2,558. Negroes constitute approximately 28 per cent of this figure. Student distribution includes five school districts and one special school district.

Methods of educational research.--A study of this type involves three types of research. Explicit indications of the types used in this study will be listed below:

1. Historical methodology (including tracing of the legal development)
2. Descriptive-Survey
 - a. School surveys
 - b. Community surveys
 - c. Interviews
3. Evaluative method

Period of the study.--This study was made during the school year 1965-66. Comparative notes used in this study date back as early as 1886.

Subjects and materials.--Many subjects and extensive use of materials were utilized in this study. Included in this list are:

1. References in educational administration
2. Current administration and educational periodicals
3. Arkansas state and county school records
4. Federal Office of Health, Education and Welfare
5. Department of Justice
6. Court briefs and decisions:
 - a. Local
 - b. State
 - c. Federal
7. Local school questionnaires and community surveys
8. Maps of Howard County and surrounding territory
9. Selected authoritative contributions
10. Tables and graphs

Operational or procedural steps.--The procedural steps used in this study were:

1. Permission was secured from the proper authorities.
2. The literature pertinent to this problem was reviewed, abstracted and incorporated in the final thesis copy.
3. Pertinent background information and problems relative to this problem were reviewed and significant aspects incorporated into the thesis.
4. The two districts involved were given a survey as to the factors of programs, arrangements, personnel, and finance.
5. The decisions as rendered by the courts were analyzed and interpreted.
6. The plans and progress for the integrating of the respective school districts, as stimulated by the court decisions, were reviewed and interpreted.
7. An opinion poll was conducted among the citizens of each of the two districts which constitute the locale of this study.

8. All of the pertinent data from school records, from court briefs and decisions, and opinion polls were assembled in appropriate tables and graphs as dictated by the purposes of the study.
9. The findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations derived from the analysis and interpretation of the data are incorporated in the finished thesis copy.

Survey of related literature.--The nature of this study stems from the unpleasant reality that the citizens of Howard County, in Arkansas, allowed the local courts to order the creation of separate Negro school Districts with geographical boundaries substantially the same as those of the pre-existing school districts. What study could be of greater interest and consequence to any educator living in this new age?

Reference is hereby made to the various forms of techniques and methods used, but more so, to the personalities responsible for recording essential information concerning the various types of research. Two of the great contributors are G. Stanley Hall and W. A. McCall. It is also felt, by the writer, that it is necessary to point out the assistance received from references such as the Review of Educational Research, the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, The Elements of Research, and other material listed in the bibliography. The use of references of this type have enabled the writer to consolidate research advances, outline needed investigation, and prevented wasteful duplication of effort.

Nathaniel Hickerson stated that:

The people of the United States have a strong commitment to education. While the responsibility for schools has been reserved as one of the major rights of the individual states,

the Federal Government and many private agencies have been sharing a growing concern for education - its availability to all, its adequacy, and its effectiveness. As the local communities, the states and the nation seek to improve their schools, certain problems remain, some have become acute, and many seem to defy solution.¹

The problem of consolidating the Negro and White School Districts has been one such problem and appeared to defy solution for more than eighty years.

Of the many curious and significant phenomena historians have grappled with, none is perhaps more complex in its origin and unique in its development than the Negro School Districts in Howard County, Arkansas.

The existence of the two separate districts was justified during this period in several ways. The editor of "The Journal of Negro Education," voiced true sentiments in 1935 when he said:

The courts have generally held that: States have the right to establish and maintain by law separate schools (public and private, higher and lower) for the various races, provided, that the state neither taxes the several races for the sole benefit of any one race, nor taxes any single race for the sole benefit of that race. Where the power to establish and maintain separate schools is not expressly authorized by statute, or where separation of the races for educational purposes is prohibited by statute, school boards and school officials have no discretion in the matter, - neither do they have the authority to establish or maintain separate schools, nor even separate classes, based solely upon racial distinctions.²

Realizing the truth in the above statement and the basic

¹ Nathaniel Hickerson, "Physical Integration Alone is Not Enough," The Journal of Negro Education, XXV (Spring, 1966), p. 110.

² Charles H. Thompson, "Profiles of Education," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), p. 289.

foundations upon which this truth is based, one cannot help but wonder why Negroes have been and are still confronted with the problem of being legally forced into separate schools which are characterized by notorious and increasing discrimination.

Other aspects of this study are pointed out in an article by Director Horace Mann Bond:

We have said that the separate school is an instrument of policy in the hands of the dominant group, with a foundation upon the concept of racial inequality and unassimilability. It has been suggested that the structural inferiority of the system that is actually "separated" - the Negro system - must be regarded as an inevitable concomitant of such a system.¹

If the writer interprets the above statement correctly - meaning that the Negroes in separate schools are "unheard" partners to the structures which abuse their legal rights, then, it is felt that the handicapped prey should seek methods for emancipation, regardless to the cost.

Contrasting opinions are noted on this matter. One clear example is noted below:

Court Action the Only Reasonable Alternative to Remedy Immediate Abuses of the Negro Separate School²

Court Action by Negroes to Improve Their Schools a Doubtful Remedy³

¹Dr. Horace Mann Bond, "The Extent and Character of Separate Schools in the United States," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), p. 321.

²Charles H. Thompson, "Court Action the Only Reasonable Alternative to Remedy Immediate Abuses of the Negro Separate School," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), p. 419.

³W. T. B. Williams, "Court Action by Negroes to Improve Their Schools a Doubtful Remedy," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), p. 435.

Court action should be taken immediately, as seen by the writer, by any community which is denied choice privileges in providing education for the youth of each attendance area.

T. E. Patterson, Executive Secretary, Arkansas Teachers Association, stated in an interview on April 19, 1966:

An administrator, in this age, must be discrete in movement but objective in behavior. We cannot simply stand by and let the Negro children of our State suffer injustices of this type any longer. Methods must be discovered to assure the community that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will support them in their most important struggle.¹

This study, at this point tends to reflect this image when one notes the progress made by parents and school personnel in the 1965-1966 struggle for consolidation of all districts (dual) in Howard County, Arkansas.

It is hoped by the writer that not a segregated school district or single unit of any school district will rest until the Court prays that an order enjoining the abusers, their agents, officers, successors, and all those in active concert or participation with them from maintaining dual school systems based upon race or color; from failing to provide equal educational opportunities to all students in the same geographic area without regard to the students' race or color; and from receiving federal funds as stipulated in the guidelines from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Summary.--The preliminary survey of literature points to such significant aspects of the problem as characterized in the separate

¹ Interview with T. E. Patterson, Executive Secretary, ATA, April 19, 1966.

statements below:

1. 1954 court decision ushered in era of political unrest.
2. Provokement of sectional, city and statewide struggles.
3. Literature indicates that the White citizen became adamant in the face of the court order.
4. In implementation of court orders, many expressed and unexpressed fears on the part of citizenry and teachers.
5. There have been varying degrees for the extent to which school districts and state wide departments of education have made to comply with the 1964 court decisions and the separate court decisions and guidelines.

It is hoped, by the writer, that the worth of this study will readily be seen by the reader and will afford an increased knowledge in the legal techniques now being employed by the Federal Government in order to assure sound education for all. It is further hoped that the usefulness of this work may be of major interest and value to following generations.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Frame-of-Reference

The primary objective of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive, concise overview of the concepts and practices of the school districts of Howard County, Arkansas, and the change of the separate Negro and white school districts into a single integrated system. By presenting clear cut and accurate findings, free from dogma, it should help the students of education to combat the vagueness with which they often confront, to a great degree, in professional discussions involving the structure of school districts in America.

Professional educators, however, are not the only ones who have a vital interest in these types of educational practices. Just as the school has become increasingly aware of the world that lies beyond its walls, so has the community taken more and more interest in what goes on in relation to its schools. Traditionally, education in the United States has always been a matter of public concern; it is significant that the board of education, the body that decides matters of policy, is generally composed of laymen and not of professional educators. For educational advance to be translated from theory into practice we need an alert, informed public opinion that is sensitive

to the implications of educational theories and that understands the goal towards which the school is striving. Public opinion, however, tends to see the immediate problems rather than the more basic issues. Even, today, it is only the exceptional parent who views educational problems from a broader point of view than that of the immediate future of his child. Taxpayers' groups, for example, often press for the deletion of specific items from the annual school budget without understanding that the economy may be a wasteful one in the course of years. It is clear, however, that in controversies between the school and the public neither side is always right. The informed layman may sometimes see social and economic implications in an educational program to which teachers and supervisors are not sensitive because of their complete identification with it. Thoughtful public opinion may serve as a corrective to professional judgment. If this study adds to the understanding which public-spirited citizens have of educational problems, the writer will consider his efforts well rewarded.

One of the first problems in the preparation of a study of this type is the selection of topics to be included. The master-list of the items treated in this chapter was prepared only after many listings of associated topics had been analyzed and after the tentative master-list had been examined by the writer and by several other educators representing specialized fields. The present master-list reflects a consensus of informed opinion; it is no hastily prepared record of the writer's intuition. It was often disappointing to omit

a given topic, yet the omission of relatively less urgent subjects was necessary in order to assure the adequate treatment of more significant problems. The selection of items was complicated further by the fact that data concerning separate Negro School Districts is not an isolated body of facts, therefore, it is often difficult to decide where to draw the outer boundaries. Confining itself to areas that are clearly within the field of education or that lie in closely related fields, this study nevertheless reflects the surprising breadth of the activities in the educational enterprise. The articles range from as specific an item as the teachers' legal responsibility for carrying out contract to as fundamental a question as the role of indoctrination in American education.

In some instances it was possible to illustrate and dramatize the scope of the study by making use of charts and graphs. The reader is referred to specific charts and graphs in which a concept is explained thus he can or does avoid a great number of overlapping articles. Similarly, the practice of appending brief, carefully selected bibliographies to all important articles enabled the writer to present a concise article that would meet the immediate needs of most readers and to indicate how this will assist others in future involvements.

Typical of the problem of the selection of topics was the difficulty experienced in the area of comparative studies. A study of school districts should devote considerable attention to the educational practices in other sections of the country. The difficult question is how much attention it should receive. To have included

discussions of all the educational systems in the United States involved in district consolidation and school desegregation would have little room for anything else.

Another major problem was that of approximating objectivity in a field that is often sharply controversial. In some instances, separate statements were prepared by exponents of different points of view. In other instances, it was possible to present various points-of-view in the same article. Thus, some statements will be the crystallized formulation of various theories and practices.

Some topics stress detailed historical treatment and others stress the kind of specialized techniques that a research worker has to master. The writer's major interest lay in the preparation of a presentation that would aid the student of education as well as teachers, administrators and other interested persons to find clear and concise explanations of the basic ideas and movements of separate Negro School Districts in Arkansas.

Introductory statement.--We are not living in an ideal democracy. We are living in a period of transition and confusion, which means that our school governing structures have a much larger and more difficult task. Their first and immediate task is so to organize their activities as to cultivate the spirit of cooperation and loyalty to the group in which democracy has its roots. A further task is the clarifying or intellectualizing of the basic principles of democracy; that conflicts of a group with other groups, or conflicts within a group, are to be adjusted, wherever possible, not by taking our stand on eternal and immutable principles and values, but by discovering

wider and more inclusive aims and purposes to which all can contribute as a common undertaking.

It is said that progress in this direction must necessarily be slow, but much has already been accomplished. The changes have resulted from the decisions by the Federal Government and the progress that has been made in the realization that democracy has an ethics of its own, which conflict at vital points with traditional beliefs and practices. The realization that a choice of underlying philosophies is involved is still unclear, and it must be achieved if democratic education is to become completely conscious of what it is doing and if it is to enable the oncoming generation to assume intelligent direction of its affairs.

General nature of the problem.--From the South, in the past twelve years, has come a steady stream of calls for help as Negro students, parents, teachers, and administrators attempted to break the traditional pattern of school segregation.

It has been and still is widely assumed by many white citizens, school board members and school administrators that Negroes, both students and teachers, are intellectually inferior. From this specious premise, it follows that "quality education can be attained or maintained only if pupils and teachers are separated along racial lines: quality education and school desegregation are viewed as antithetical.

What, then, can a community do to change the situation when its school district is forced to desegregate, either under a federal court order, or by a federal agency enforcing compliance with a federal statute, or when federal funds make it advantageous to keep the Negro children at home? At first they have integrated only to the extent that the federal court or federal agency has stipulated as an acceptable minimum. In most cases this means a freedom-of-choice plan, which places the burden of choice upon Negro parents and children instead of the school board and administration. Where there is no, or only partial, desegregation, the effect of the

freedom-of-choice is to maintain student segregation or to promote student re-segregation.

Often the school district continued to preserve the white schools in a form as nearly unchanged as possible, by using what might be called a containment policy on "the intruding Negro element." If the district is successful, it will prevent the development of any genuinely integrated schools. The nearly universal absence of white transfer pupils allows the Negro schools to continue as Negro schools, if they are not closed entirely. But usually, the white schools, even after being integrated, remain in spirit and often in name "white schools."¹

At a time when many areas face the problem of district reorganization, it has been reported that both Negro and White residents, throughout the South, remain satisfied with retaining their own uniqueness under unfair circumstances. At a time when the nation is concerned about the plight of the Negro masses and the poor as evidenced by the passage of the Civil Rights Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Voting Rights Act, some districts in the South are satisfied with the acts of gerrymander and make every attempt to resist compliance, while others are employing practices which tend to curtail or reduce discrimination within the districts for reason of race.

The modern courts are presently making specific decisions and rulings throughout not only the South but the North as well, geared toward equalization of opportunities, and providing sound education for all.

Areas for sources of data.---Any study as comprehensive as this

¹
National Education Association, Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Southern States, A report prepared by the National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities (Washington: National Education Association, December, 1966), pp. 22-23.

must be supported by data from many sources.

The writer has explored literature, both old and new; research material of similar types; survey questionnaires, opinion polls and interviews; survey and summary of charts and graphs; federal court orders and guidelines; and the writer utilized unbiased thinking in the analysis and interpretation of these data in preparing the final copy of this presentation.

Historical background of problem.---In order for the reader to gain proper prospective and bearing on the problem and in an attempt to portray the historical background of this research in some systematic fashion, the writer, at this point, has re-emphasized the focus on the locale of the study.

Howard County is the 51st in population. It is situated in the middle southwest corner of the state, covers 102 square miles and is inhabited by some 10,878. Table 1, page 20, shows a population breakdown to provide the reader with some insight as to the Negro-white ratio of the county. Nashville is the county seat and here we find two of the districts that are subjects in this study. Tollette, a predominately Negro community, located 12 miles southwest of Nashville, includes the other separate Negro School District in this unique study.

Founding of the separate Negro school districts.---Prior to 1886 a single school district enveloped the geographical area in and around Nashville, Arkansas, presently covered by the Nashville Special School District No. 1 and the Childress School District No. 39.

TABLE 1

RATIO OF POPULATION IN HOWARD COUNTY - 1960

Rural Population	
Subject	Howard County, Arkansas
Total Population	6,023
White	4,659
Negro	1,359
Other Races	5
Urban Population	
Subject	Howard County, Arkansas
Total Population	3,597
White	2,835
Negro	743
Other Races	1

On August 10, 1886, by order of the Howard County Court, Howard County, Arkansas, the Childress School District No. 39 was created with geographical boundaries substantially the same as those of the pre-existing school district, now known as the Nashville Special School District No. 1.

The purpose for the creation of the Childress School District No. 39 was to provide separate educational facilities for children of the Negro race.

Prior to 1886 a single school district enveloped the geographical area in and around Mineral Springs, Arkansas, presently covered by the

Mineral Springs School District No. 3 and the Howard County School District No. 38.

On July 5, 1886, by order of the Howard County Court, Howard County, Arkansas, the Howard County School District No. 38 was created. The geographical boundaries of the said school district presently include all of the geographical area in Howard County described by the boundaries of the Saratoga School District No. 11 and the Mineral Springs School District No. 3, except for that portion of the Mineral Springs School District No. 3 which overlays the Childress School District.

The purpose of the Howard County School District No. 38 was to provide separate educational facilities for children of the Negro race.

Fiscal structure.--Negroes were listed on separate books for tax purposes. The property tax book for Howard County contained two listings for each township, one for white persons and one for Negroes. This is how the decision in tax revenue was made.

The Nashville Special School District No. 1 levied and collected taxes from white property owners and the Childress School District No. 39 levied and collected taxes from the Negro property owners in their jointly covered area. The Nashville Special School District No. 1 levied upon the white-owned property at a rate of 40 mills per 100 dollar valuation, whereas, the Childress School District No. 39 levied upon the Negro-owned property at a rate of 42 miles per 100 dollar valuation.

The Mineral Springs School District No. 3 levied and collected taxes from white property owners and the Howard County Training School District No. 38 levied and collected taxes from the Negro property owners in their jointly covered area. (See Table 2, page 23)

The Saratoga School District No. 11 levied and collected taxes from white property owners and the Howard County Training School District No. 38 levied and collected taxes from the Negro property owners in their jointly covered area.

It might be added that neither of the two Negro school districts received local utility tax or Industrial tax allocations.

Caught in these webs, the Negro School Districts were left to face days of expanding budgets and increasing competition for the tax dollar. Obviously, the quantity and quality of the individual school's educational program fell short due to the inability of the school districts to finance them.

Board of education.---The board of education is the local educational authority created by legislative act and as such becomes the agency for the administration of the schools of the community. In practice, boards of education act in accordance with mandatory state laws and deliberate upon the provisions of permissive legislation. There are as many kinds of boards of education as there are types of school districts; there are boards for common school districts, town and township districts, county districts, and city districts, all differing somewhat in size, selection of members, organization and function.

The Negro citizens of Howard County, Arkansas elect their own

TABLE 2

MILL RATIO TAX - HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS

District	Ratio			Total	District	Ratio			Total
	1964					1965			
	M & O DS					M & O DS			
Childress	16	26	42		Childress	16	26	42	
Howard	16	24	40		Howard	16	24	40	
Mineral Springs	23.5	21.5	45		Mineral Springs	23.5	21.5	45	
Nashville	21	19	40		Nashville	21	19	40	
Saratoga*	28	12	40		Saratoga	28	12	40	

* Denotes: District of another county (Hemstead).

school board by popular vote in elections held at a time other than the time of municipal, local, state, and national elections. The first school board for the Childress School District No. 39 was elected in 1886. The earliest names of board members revealed in this study were: W. E. Kelley, president, J. P. Hamilton, secretary, Finis Young, L. C. Coulter and C. P. Kelley.

The earliest names of board members for the Howard County Training School District No. 38 were: Authur White, president, W. M. Thomas, secretary, Jeff Wagner, Eliza Walker, and Cleveland Garland.

The initial boards of education had as one of their major responsibilities, the selection of a superintendent for each respective Negro district. The superintendents would be delegated the

executive functions of the schools within the separate school districts.

The first school superintendents for the Childress School District No. 39 and the Howard County Training School District No. 38 were selected in 1886. In each case the executive personnel held only the Bachelor's degree.

Patterns of the segregated systems.---The study of the patterns of the separate Negro school districts in Howard County, Arkansas, brings into focus many problems incident to the education of the minority Negro race in segregated schools in the United States, and in colonial areas of European powers where Negroes live. In many ways the study is closely related to studies of Negro education, a term used for convenience and it is unfortunate that the usage of the term sometimes suggests the existence of essentially qualitative racial differences.

Dr. Horace Mann Bond, while President of Fort Valley State College, voiced true sentiments when he wrote an article on Negro education in which he posed many supporting points which tend to give clearer meaning to the study presented here.

Negro education is co-extensive with the existence of schools enrolling only or principally Negroes. The area involved many states and the District of Columbia where the segregation of races in public schools is in existence and in many cases enforced by a public opinion founded in ancient traditional practices. There are also many segregated schools for Negroes in other states, principally in the eastern and middle-western states where the concentration of Negro populations within the last generation has resulted in public school segregation. Public demand for racial segregation in the schools appears to be a symptom of periods of racial maladjustment. In the pre-Civil War period, Negroes were generally excluded from public schools of all kinds in middle-western states; and they were educated at public

expense only in separate schools in such states as New York and New Jersey. The extension of more liberal attitudes following the Civil War results in the admission of Negroes to the general public schools in most of the states of the North. Following the heavy migration of Negroes to northern urban areas, a considerable public opinion to segregate Negroes became manifest in those areas. In states where the laws forbid the principle of racial segregation in schools, the segregation of Negroes has been achieved by drawing school district lines to coincide with areas of segregated racial residence.¹

This is the point of differentiation in this study. The school district lines drawn in Howard County, Arkansas are substantially the same yet Negroes have been expected and compelled to attend all Negro schools. Bond further states:

The work of Allison Davis and Charles Johnson, and the investigations by the American Youth Commission have made a profound contribution to this enlarged understanding. To-day, when we speak of "Negro Education" we are thinking of a separated administrative structure, separated at the base but unified at the top in white administrators; but we think increasingly, also, in terms of a group of children and adults whose entire life is conditioned by circumstances peculiar to their existence as a racial minority. The American child is, in theory, to be educated for a world of equal opportunity; no limits are set upon his achievement. The same theory may apply to Negro children; but the necessity for realism in the face of the semi-caste status of the American Negro is much greater than that demanded for other American children and their schools.²

Since the creation of the Childress School District No. 39 in 1886, the Childress School District No. 39 has enrolled Negro but not white school children residing in the geographical area covered

¹ Horace Mann Bond, "Negro Education," Encyclopedia of Modern Education, ed. Harry N. Rivlin and Herbert Schueler (New York: F. Hubner & Co., 1943), p. 533.

² Ibid., p. 533.

by both it and the Nashville Special School District No. 1; and the Nashville Special School District No. 1 has enrolled white but not Negro school children residing in the same area.

Since the creation of the Childress School District No. 39 in 1886, the Childress School District has enrolled Negro but not white school children residing in the geographical area previously described and the Mineral Springs School District No. 3 has enrolled white but not Negro school children residing in the same area.

Since the creation of the Howard County Training School District No. 38 in 1886, the Howard County Training School District No. 38 has enrolled Negro but not white school children residing in the geographical area jointly covered by it and the Mineral Springs School District No. 3; and the Mineral Springs School District No. 3 has enrolled white but not Negro school children residing within the same area.

Since the creation of the Howard County Training School District No. 38 in 1868, the Howard County Training School District No. 38 has enrolled Negro but not white school children residing in the geographical area within Howard County jointly covered by it and the Saratoga School District No. 11 and the Saratoga School District No. 11 has enrolled white but no Negro school children within the same area.

School finance.--Speaking of the factor of school finance and the educational opportunity of Negroes and the disadvantaged southern states, Bond emphasized:

Children from a defective social and economic milieu

need greater facilities to repair their initial handicaps than well-advantaged children and yet the whole history of American education reveals that we have consistently provided, in private schools, better educational opportunities for the children with better initial advantages, and poorer opportunities for the handicapped child. This condition is aggravated where Negroes are concerned. As the American children farthest down in the economic scale, coming from the most illiterate stratum and the area of worst health habits and practices, they should logically require an extraordinary proportion of school expenditures if true equalization of educational opportunity is to be achieved. In fact, they receive extraordinarily low proportions of expenditures. This is true in the quasi-segregated systems of Northern cities as in legally segregated systems in the South. The differences may range from a State like Mississippi, where the annual per capita expenditures for Negro children are typically one-fourth those for white children, to a Northern city where per capita may appear to be more even, but where classrooms may be crowded, buildings antiquated, and inspired or sympathetic teaching absent. In the South the situation is complicated by the poverty of the section, and the high proportion of educables -- black and white -- to adults and resources, as compared with other sections of the country.¹

When we examine the financial structure of the Howard County Schools, it is clearly seen that the separate Negro school districts have not received the income per capita needed for adequate and sound educational programs. In 1964 the valuation of the property of the white property owners within the Nashville-Childress school district boundaries was \$2,104,545; whereas, the valuation of the property of the Negro property owners within the Nashville-Childress school boundaries was \$123,070 in 1964.

The amount of local tax revenues available per pupil of the Nashville Special School District No. 1 was \$161.50 in 1964. The amount of local tax revenues available per pupil of the Childress

¹Ibid., p. 535.

School District No. 39 was \$35.71 in 1964.

Summary Table 5, Appendix C, shows the wide range in expenditures for both races, with the income for white far in excess of that for Negroes. This table is of a general nature and includes findings for all of the school districts of the county that were covered in this study.

Facilities.--The facilities and education provided Negro children by the Childress School District No. 39 and Howard County Training School District No. 38 were substantially inferior to the facilities and education provided white children by the Nashville Special School District No. 1.

At no time since the founding of the Negro school districts in Arkansas have the districts been financially capable of providing adequate school facilities for their students. The boards of education put forth their best efforts year after year to provide more and better accommodations for the people whom they served. The schools thrived for many years on war surplus buildings and renovated classrooms, poorly lighted and no regulated heat. Shortage of lavatories and water coolers was a common problem for many years. Crowded classrooms and lunchrooms added to the inconvenience of the students and teachers.

A disastrous fire destroyed all that had been accumulated in the middle forties, necessitating the emergency facilities of churches and business establishments to host classes for the unfortunate pupils.

During the summer of 1953, an elementary school building was erected on the Childress campus. Scab labor and voluntary help from

many and varied sources were solicited, thus resulting in a poorly constructed, but badly needed school facility.

In 1960, the Childress Board found means to erect a high school building. This endeavor required personal sacrifices on the part of individual members of the Board. Due to lack of funds and insufficient borrowing power (based on assessed valuation), personal signatures were affixed to promissory notes with the local bank in order to secure necessary funds. This sacrifice turned out to be a worthy one, for this facility, upon completion, was one of the finest in the county at that time. The "glory" of this effort still remains embedded in the hearts of many citizens in Howard County. They can easily visualize the "Old Centerpoint School House" (a rural community school taken into consolidation some ten years prior) being sawed into four different sections and brought, by truck, to the Childress campus. They can visualize the beautiful bricks and interior paneling purchased with "blood" money and placed in their appropriate places by skilled laborers, board members, teachers and citizens as well. But too, they can remember that this was not enough. The facility was still far below the standards of efficiency in facilitating instruction and meeting the needs of the community.

Most states and local governmental units prescribe for school buildings certain minimum standards with respect to safety, sanitation, and general character of construction. These standards incorporated in the school laws and municipal ordinances are intended to protect the school children and the occupants of adjacent property from injury resulting from faulty construction, careless habits, or fire.

The Negro schools did not meet these standards. These standards; however, reflected the ideals of authorities of the opposite race, for at no time were any provisions made by them for improved conditions of Negro schools during this period.

School personnel.--A report of "The Task Force Survey" contained this statement:

. . . . It is clear that in the past Negro teachers were employed specifically and exclusively for the purpose of teaching Negro pupils in racially segregated schools. Segregated schools required segregated students bodies taught by segregated faculties. If considerable numbers of Negroes resided in a school district, the usual procedure was to provide for all practical purposes a separate school system for them; if the number of Negro students was relatively small, contracts were often made to transport them to Negro school districts.¹

The school personnel situation in Howard County, Arkansas differs from this procedure, inasmuch as the Negro teachers were employed by a Negro Board; however, the trend of employment of school personnel within the Negro districts was much the same as that of any other school district. The Negro districts; however, due to the financial status, were unable to employ and retain "quality" teachers.

The districts did not offer tenure to provide security that would protect the experienced teachers.

The Summary Table 5, Appendix C, shows the average salaries for the schools involved in this study and points out the contrast in

¹ National Education Association, Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Southern States, A Report Prepared by the National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities (Washington: National Education Association, December, 1966), p. 22.

salaries between the Negro school districts and the white school districts in Howard County, Arkansas.

Tuition.---Prior to 1964, students were transported by bus from adjoining communities, both in and outside Howard County. Murfreesboro, in Pike County, Arkansas and Dierks, in Howard County, both paid for Negro pupils to be transported to the Negro schools in Nashville. Murfreesboro furnished a small, one-teacher, elementary school for its Negro community and furnished both elementary and high school facilities for the white community, at the same time. Negro pupils were transported from Murfreesboro to Nashville by the Childress School District and received from the Murfreesboro School District \$121.48 per pupil per year for this service.

Unlike Murfreesboro, Dierks afforded only schools for its white community. All Negro pupils were transported to the Childress schools in Nashville and tuition was paid at the rate of \$105.18 per pupil per year.

Conditions of a technical nature required the Nashville School District No. 1 to pay tuition for a number of Negro pupils. The Nashville School District extended into Hemstead County but the Childress School District did not. Some Negro pupils living in this area of Hemstead County desired to attend school in Nashville, Howard County, Arkansas; therefore, this responsibility became that of Nashville School District since these students resided within their established geographical boundaries. Rather than to transport these few students on the same buses with their regular students, the Nashville School District paid the rate of \$165.00 per pupil per

year to the Childress School District for this service.

In September, 1964, Murfreesboro desegregated in compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and totally integrated all phases of its educational program. No separate schools were maintained for Negroes. In September, 1965, Dierks followed along the same lines. Beginning with the fall of 1965, no tuition was paid the Childress School District by the Nashville School District even though these pupils were transported to the Negro schools by the Childress School District.

This distribution or apportionment of funds constituted an important phase of the Negro schools' fiscal structure but new legislation has curtailed this unfair and unlawful scheme of evasiveness.

Transportation and consolidation.---The real development of pupil transportation has had to await the coming of better roads and the consolidation of schools. Originally, schools sprang into being at small centers of populations; as individual families moved into the surrounding territory and as land surveys were made, one-room schools were established, nine to the township or one for each plot of land two miles square, in many sections of the country. This placed a schoolhouse within easy walking distance of every child within the township.

But social needs gradually outgrew the one-room school; pressure for the consolidation of schools began to be felt. Then came the automobile and the demand for good roads that would provide for more effective use of this new means of transportation. This latter movement supplemented the former. Regardless of the need for consolidation,

little progress could be made in that direction until means were provided for transporting pupils over greater distances. With the arrival of both the automobile and the hard roads, an ideal setting was arranged for the consolidation of schools and with it for the increased transportation of pupils.

These practices are of true historical origin and tend to portray the matter of events that are undertaken by most rural and suburban schools.

School authorities of the Howard County School District No. 38 and the Childress School District No. 39 have met with many problems in making the transportation of pupils rapid, efficient and safe. For many years, these districts have transported students on crowded buses for many miles and in many instances passed by several schools along the way. Many school sessions have begun with buses out of order or without a sufficient number. Again, lack of needed finance was usually given as the justification for this deficiency.

Many recent studies tend to show that school transportation is costly and that automobiles are perhaps more expensive; however, for this study, other criteria are perhaps more important than costs. Should buses necessarily run the long routes as commonly practiced?

A two year comparison of transportation and for all districts in Howard County is given in Summary Table 5, Appendix C.

Instructional materials.--Good learning situations are ones that make it possible for pupils to use materials through which they can learn more effectively. It is in the area of instructional materials that the greatest progress has been made in the last decade. The

modern approach to education involves the establishment of a challenging learning environment within which children are motivated and guided toward desirable educational goals.

The Negro school districts of Howard County possessed nothing more than inadequate instructional materials for many years. The Negro schools of this locale suffered long before the N. D. E. A. Act, Title III and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) brought new life to the community by providing means for securing additional instructional materials.

The N. D. E. A. was instrumental in providing science and mathematics equipment and guidance services to the school and the effects of this initiated Act was readily seen in each of the areas.

Title I helped to provide conditions of better schooling focused on education for the educationally deprived children.

Title II improved library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. The Allocation by Titles for the state of Arkansas for the fiscal year 1966 is shown below.¹

TABLE 3

ESEA ALLOCATION OF FUNDS - FISCAL YEAR 1966

State	Title I	Title II	Title III	Title V
Arkansas	22,826,021	937,854	847,491	198,097

¹ United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Profile of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, A Report Prepared by the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 26.

The allocation for the Childress School District was approximately \$20,000; however, only a percentage of this figure was used for instructional materials.

School attendance.--It was not until 1852 that a compulsory attendance law was passed in this country. It was as late as 1918 before the laws became valid in all the states.

One of the most perplexing problems faced by public schools today is attendance; for regular attendance is essential to the efficient functioning of the school organization. The public schools in the United States, have had their functions determined by the ideals and aspirations of the society which they serve. Therefore, public schools are committed to a policy of educating its citizens for a free society.

In order to further illustrate the patterns of the Negro school districts, included in this study, the writer feels that attendance records should be presented for greater clarity and to enable the reader to compare school attendance throughout the county. An attendance chart of Howard County, Table 4, for a six year period, is given on page 36.

Curricula.--The schools of Howard County, Arkansas, to a certain degree, have varied in the content of general school offerings. This contrast, however, is not as broad as one might expect when considering that there is no unified county or city guide for instruction.

The state of Arkansas provides guidelines that all state supported schools must follow; however, the differences have been prevalent simply because of the inability of some schools to finance

TABLE 4

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE - HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS

School	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66
Nashville	934	914	921	945	958	924
Dierks	590	573	571	577	574	583
Mineral Springs	285	258	253	254	247	248
North Howard	140	132	123	124	126	124
Childress	284	294	285	350	382	361
Howard County Training School	413	407	373	409	391	313

enrichment units and to employ needed personnel for the implementation. Obviously, the Negro schools within separate Negro school districts showed the greater contrast as well as limitations. Some typical reasons for this limitation of curricula in Negro schools were:

1. Lack of finance
2. Lack of qualified personnel
3. Lack of facilities

It might be noted; however, that the Negro schools strived to close this gap, even under the adverse circumstances mentioned above. This endeavor placed hardships on the teachers of these schools. Enriched curricula necessitated extra working hours on the part of the professional staffs. Extra duties had to be performed by many in order to carry out the school's program.

Physical education was offered in the schools, and in one case,

all activities were carried out-of-doors since the school had no gymnasium. Band was offered at one time in each of the Negro high schools; however, the Childress School had to give up this activity due to lack of finance for employing a director and purchasing needed band equipment.

The Negro schools participated in only basketball and track. Neither school had an athletic field; however, the Nashville School District cooperated with the Childress School District in helping it carry out basketball and track schedules.

A typical example of differences in school curricula will be treated under another topic.

School accreditation.--The schools of Howard County, Arkansas show a multiplicity of classes as designated by the Arkansas State Department of Education. Arkansas is accredited by the North Central Association for Schools and Colleges.

School evaluation is accomplished by visits and inspections by State School Supervisors and Evaluation Teams. These persons usually visit all schools no less than twice in any given year. The criteria used is printed in handbooks and guides for school accreditation.

An example of the disparity in school accreditation in Howard County can be seen when one notes examples of school rating of three schools in the county:

Childress High School - Negro - C (low)

Howard County Training School - Negro - B (intermediate)

Nashville High School - White - N. C. (North Central)

Impact of the 1964 Civil Rights ruling.--From the time of passage of the Civil Rights Act in July of 1964, and particularly during the first three months after the Title VI regulation became effective in January of 1965, the Office of Education urged local school districts to come forward with effective desegregation plans to desegregate the schools in the segregated districts as expeditiously as possible.

In observing the situation, the writer and any other fair-minded person, will testify that the school districts did not respond to this policy in a responsible fashion. It is well known that local political conditions were used as excuses rather than forthright, good faith efforts to desegregate, but the fact remains that most districts let it be known that they would not do any more in desegregating their schools than the minimum required of them.

It became clear that something had to be done to stimulate these and other districts, if there were to be compliance of any kind. Suits calling for desegregation were initiated by parents throughout the United States; transfers to white schools were requested by students attending all Negro schools; and the Office of Education saw the need for guidelines to meet the demand for a statement of minimum requirements.

The citizens of most southern states began to develop community spirit and a sense of responsibility that prompted them into seeking help to require school districts to carry out the minimal requirements of those first guidelines.

Emergent guidelines.--The impact of the 1964 Civil Rights and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare guidelines

were felt by school districts throughout the United States, both Negro and white alike. Section 181.2 states:

To be eligible for federal aid, a school system must act to eliminate any practices in violation of Title VI, including the continued maintenance of a dual structure of separate schools for students of different races (181.4). To be eligible for federal aid, a school system must first assure the commissioner that it will comply with Title VI and the H. E. W. regulation. It must submit the form of assurance that meets its circumstances (181.5). A school system which does not maintain any characteristic of a dual school structure may initially demonstrate compliance by submitting H. E. W. Form 441. This is an assurance of full and immediate compliance with Title VI.¹

To cite another example, the five sections of the Civil Rights Act which provide the opportunity for the United States Office of Education to turn out thousands of words of interpretation and guidelines for the enforcement of the Act (PL 88-352), as it effects the distribution of federal financial assistance to schools, are contained in one printed page.

The empowering section (602) states:

Each federal department and agency which is empowered to extend federal financial assistance to any program or activity is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with the achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken.²

The districts involved, in operating and directing these respective public school systems, have received and are receiving financial aid and assistance under various federal programs

¹ Arthur H. Rice, "Federal Guidelines Actually Control Public School Policy," Nation's Schools, LXXVII, No. 6 (June, 1966), pp. 10 and 104.

² Ibid., p. 104.

administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Pursuant to Articles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing General Statement of Policies Under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Respecting Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools adopted by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and as a condition to receiving federal financial assistance as described previously, Nashville Special School District No. 1, Childress School District No. 39, and Howard County Training School District No. 38 filed Assurances of Compliance (Form 441) with the United States Office of Education, which were accepted on May 3 and May 13, 1965.

In these Assurances of Compliance the districts referred to above, agreed in writing that they would not consider the race or color of pupils in their enrollment, assignment or transfer.

The manner in which the respective school systems were operated by the districts involved violated the Assurances of Compliance.

Pursuant to Articles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing General Statement of Policies under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Respecting Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools adopted by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education which was accepted on August 23, 1965.

Saratoga School District No. 11 has never applied its voluntary desegregation plan to Negro school children living in the geographical area jointly covered by the said school district and the Howard County Training School District No. 38.

The manner in which the respective school systems were operated by the districts involved violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in that Negro citizens were excluded from participation in, denied benefits of, and subjected to discrimination because of their race or color under a program receiving federal funds as described previously.

The creation, establishment and operation of the Childress School District No. 39 denied equal protection of the laws to children of school age residing in Howard County, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The creation, establishment and operation of the Howard County Training School District No. 38 denied equal protection of the laws to children of school age residing in Howard County, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Realizing the truth in their past practices virtually sent some of the subjects into hysteria but the arbitrary and inflexible manner in which the school districts were set up prohibited either the local districts or its school boards to ask for leniency.

The initial desegregation suit.--For more than eighty years, the Negro community of Howard County, Arkansas had to live with the knowledge that the children of Howard County had been pushed aside, into the all Negro school districts, for their education and that this practice was unconstitutional and resulted in a much higher expenditure per pupil in the white school districts. Finally, some one felt the urge to see this district structure abolished.

On December 20, 1965, the plaintiffs filed their complaint

in this case under 28 U. S. C. Section 134 (3) and (4), 28 U. S. C. Sections 2201 and 2202, and 42 U. S. C. Sections 1981 and 1983 seeking a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against alleged conduct of the Nashville Special School District No. 1, and Childress School District No. 39 denying them the equal protection of the law on account of race or color, in violation of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U. S. C. Section 1983.

The plaintiffs were Negro citizens of the United States who presently reside in that portion of Howard County, Arkansas, which was encompassed by both the Nashville Special School District No. 1 and the Childress School District No. 39.

The defendants were the Nashville Special School District No. 1 and the Childress School District No. 39 both of which are located in Howard County, Arkansas.

Districts No. 1 and 39 as defendants.--Robert Coulter was president and Logan Coulter, Jesse Hickerson, U. L. Atkins and Tom McGee were members of the board of school directors of the Childress School District No. 39 and were charged under Arkansas State. Sections 80-501 et seq. with the powers and duties to administer, control and supervise all matters pertaining to the public schools administered by the Childress School District No. 39.

Tommy Lee Walton was the Superintendent of Schools for the Childress School District No. 39. He was charged under Arkansas State with the responsibility of directing the affairs of the school district.

Barney B. Smith is president and Gene Arrington, Sim Ellis, Maxie D. Blackwell and Bobby Steel are members of the board of school directors of the Nashville Special School District No. 1 and were charged under Arkansas State. Articles et seq. with the powers and duties to administer, control and supervise all matters pertaining to the public schools administered by the Nashville Special School District No. 1.

Elbert Thomas Moody is the Superintendent of Schools for the Nashville Special School District No. 1. He was charged under Arkansas State. Articles with the responsibility of directing the affairs of this school district.¹

¹U. S. District Court Order, Civil Action No. 962, 1966.

Petition asks school consolidation.--A news article contained in a December issue of the Arkansas Gazette explains the suit:

Parents of Negro students asked for immediate consolidation of Nashville and Childress School districts in Federal court at Texarkana Monday.

The parents asked for consolidation on a non-racial basis beginning the second term of the current school year, maintaining that the Childress school was inferior to the Nashville school because of a shortage of tax revenue.

Earlier this fall, six parents had asked the U. S. Office of Education in Washington protesting the existence of dual school districts. John W. Walker, Little Rock attorney for the families, said that since the Office of Education had taken no action, the parents decided to file the suit in an effort to get some relief before the second semester begins.

The case goes to Federal Judge John E. Miller of Fort Smith.

The suit listed the members of the Nashville School Board as Maxie D. Blackwell, Barney B. Smith, Bovvy Steel, Sim Ellis and Gene Arrington, and the Childress School Board as Robert Coulter, Logan Coulter, U. L. Atkins and Jesse Hickerson.

The federal suit plaintiffs are Rev. Johnny McGee on behalf of Charles, Deborah, Stanley and Gergory McGhee; Mrs. Winnie Marshall on behalf of Gwendolyn and Travis Marshall; Mrs. Annie Mae Benson; Mrs. Jeannette Coulter on behalf of Chester Graves, and Mrs. Nadine Scoggins on behalf of Harold Blane Scoggins.

Nashville and Childress school districts have the same general geographical boundaries in Howard County but whites and Negroes are listed on separate books for tax millages, while the white patrons did the same.

Part of the text of the story of Monday's court action is as follows:

Likewise, white pupils living within the boundaries are assigned to the Nashville School District and Negro pupils to the Childress School District. The Nashville District has about 985 students and the Childress District about 300.

The Negro plaintiffs said the Childress Schools were

inferior to the Nashville Schools because of a shortage of tax revenue. They said the Childress High School had only "C" rating from the state Department of Education but that the Nashville High School was accredited by the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

The latest report on school district revenues by the State Department of Education showed that the white property owners were paying a tax of 40 mills to the Nashville School District on property assessed at \$4,044,666, and Negro property assessed at \$293,728. The Nashville District also extends into neighboring Hempstead County, but the Childress District does not.

The property tax book for Howard County contains two listings for each township, one for white persons and one for Negroes, according to Walker. This is how the decision in tax revenue is made.

The plaintiffs asked Judge Miller to advance the case for a speedy hearing and to order the school boards of the two districts to submit a comprehensive plan, to be effective at the beginning of the second school term, for consolidation of the school districts of a non-racial basis.

They said the plan should include "non-racial assignments of pupils, the immediate desegregation of the teaching and administrative staffs and non-racial operation of the school bus system."

They also asked that the school boards be enjoined from making commitments on how it will spend federal funds from the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act until the reorganization is completed.¹

The initial suit by the Plaintiffs, is described here, in the original form, as the Statement of Facts and Conclusions of law.²

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

TEXARKANA DIVISION

¹"Petition Asks School Consolidation," Nashville News, December 21, 1965, p. 1.

²U. S. District Court for the Western Division of Arkansas, Texarkana Division, Statement of Facts and Conclusions of Law, Civil Action No. 962, 1966.

CHARLES MCGHEE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by
NICHOLAS deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General of the United
States,

CIVIL ACTION
No. 962

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

THE NASHVILLE SPECIAL SCHOOL
DISTRICT NO 1, a public body
corporate, et al.,

Defendants.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Stipulation of facts filed in this court by Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1, Childress School District No. 39, the members, presidents and superintendents of the respective boards of said school districts; the plaintiffs, Charles McGhee, et al.; and the United States of America, plaintiff-intervenor, are adopted by this court as its Statement of Facts as between the afore-said parties to the above entitled action.

THEREFORE, it is concluded that:

1. This court has jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter of the above entitled action.

2. The manner in which the respective school systems are operated by the defendants excludes Negro citizens from participation in, and denies the said citizens of the benefits of, a program receiving federal funds, all in violation of Section 601 of the Civil

Rights Act of 1964 (42 U. S. C. Section 2000d).

3. The establishment and operation of the Childress School District No. 39 and Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1, in providing segregated education, denies equal protection of the laws to children of school age residing in Howard County, Arkansas, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

NASHVILLE SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT #1:

CHILDRESS SCHOOL DISTRICT #39:

CHARLES MCGHEE, et al., Plaintiffs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Intervenor:

4. A small portion of the Childress School District No. 39 projects beyond the geographical boundaries of the Nashville Special School District No. 1 and overlays a portion of the geographical area covered by the Mineral Springs School District No. 3.

5. The purpose for the creation and the continuing effect of the Childress School District No. 39 was and is to provide separate educational facilities for children of the Negro race.

6. The division of local tax funds between the aforesaid defendants is based upon the race or color of the taxpayer.

7. The value of property owned by Negroes within the territorial boundaries of Childress School District No. 39 is insubstantial in comparison to that held by Caucasians within the same area.

8. The aforesaid defendants, in operating and directing these respective public school systems, have received and are receiving financial aid and assistance under various federal programs administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

EXECUTED this _____ day of _____, 1966

NASHVILLE, ARKANSAS SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1:

By _____
Elbert Thomas Moody,
Superintendent

By _____
Sim Ellis, Member of the
Board

By _____
Barney B. Smith, President
of the Board

By _____
Maxie D. Blackwell, Member
of the Board

By _____
Gene Arrington, Member of
the Board

By _____
Bobby Steel, Member of the
Board

CHILDRESS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39:

By _____
Robert Coulter, President
of the Board

By _____
Logan Coulter, Member of
the Board

By _____
Jesse Hickerson, Member
of the Board

By _____
V. L. Atkins, Member of
the Board

CHARLES MCGHEE, et al., Plaintiffs:

By _____
John Walker,
Attorney for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Intervenor:

By _____
Luzerne E. Hufford, Jr.
Attorney for the United
States of America

By _____
Charles M. Conway
United States Attorney

Districts No. 11, 38, and 3 as defendants.--The Attorney General certified that this case was of general public importance and his certificate was attached to the Complaint in Intervention.

The Complaint in Intervention was filed by the United States under Section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U. S. C. 2000h-2), and Rule 24, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

This procedure brought in the Howard County School District No. 38, the Mineral Springs School District No. 3, and the Saratoga School District No. 11.

Richard F. Young is president and John F. Bell, Thomas Bridgeman, R. P. Graves, and Ellis Thompson, Sr., are members of the board of school directors of the Mineral Springs School District No. 3 and were charged under Arkansas Stats. Articles 80-501 et seq. with the powers and duties to administer, control and supervise all matters

pertaining to the public schools administered by the Mineral Springs School District No. 3.

R. H. McAlister is the Superintendent of the Schools for the Mineral Springs School District No. 3. He is charged under Arkansas Stat. Section 80-202 with the responsibility of directing the affairs of this school district.

The defendants Lewis Turner, President, Julius Owens, Caesar Crofton, H. G. Graves, and J. L. Hendrix, were members of the board of school directors of the Howard County Training School District No. 38 and were charged under Arkansas Stats. Sections 80-501 et seq. With the powers and duties to administer, control and supervise all matters pertaining to the public schools administered by the Howard County Training School District No. 38.

N. R. Coulter was the Superintendent of Schools for the Howard County Training School District No. 38. He was charged under Arkansas Stat. Sec. 80-202 with the responsibility of directing the affairs of this school district.

The defendants Byron Thompson, President, Dalton Harris, C. C. Fricks, D. B. McJunkins, Jr., Mary S. Goodman, are members of the Board of School Directors of the Saratoga School District No. 11 and are charged under Arkansas Stats. Sections 80-501 et seq. with the powers and duties to administer, control and supervise all matters pertaining to the public schools administered by the Saratoga School District No. 11.

M. H. Peebles is the Superintendent of Schools for the Saratoga School District No. 11. He is charged under Arkansas Stat. Section

80-202 with the responsibility of directing the affairs of this school district.

All of the defendants named are residents of the state of Arkansas and reside within the Western District of Arkansas.

Nashville News Explains Intervention.---Excerpts of a news article bound in the Nashville News, June 10, 1966 gives a detailed explanation of the Federal Intervention:

School desegregation-or consolidation-problems in the Southern portion of the country, face an immediate shuffling about to satisfy the federal government.

U. S. District Judge Oren E. Harris, formerly the congressman from this district, gave three involved school districts until June 20th to come up with a working arrangement within desegregation lines.

The three districts, all overlapping to some degree, include Mineral Springs, Saratoga and Howard County High at Tollette. The first two are all-white at present and Howard County High is Negro.

A hearing conducted Tuesday at Texarkana led to the establishing of a deadline for the districts to work their way through the conflicts.

School authorities have been meeting with federal officials over a long period, trying to establish new district boundaries or to consolidate and desegregate. Earlier reports Tuesday indicated that the Mineral Springs and Howard County High officials were working towards consolidation. At Tuesday's hearing, however, officials said that such a consolidation would necessitate change in the Saratoga district. The Tollette School is within the Saratoga district.

If no acceptable program is developed prior to June 20th, the case will be brought to trial in federal court, although Mineral Springs and Howard County High have indicated a willingness to solve the problem.

These two districts were brought into the school desegregation picture after patrons of Childress School in Nashville brought suit to consolidate the all-white Nashville District with the all-Negro Childress District. The dispute was settled before any trial was held, with the districts agreeing to

consolidate on a desegregation basis. The Nashville district was given two years in which to desegregate.

The government amended its original suit to bring Mineral Springs, Howard County High and Saratoga into the case.

The Justice Department initiated court action last February against all three school districts, asking that they be ordered to stop maintaining dual school systems based on race.

The territory of the Howard County Training School created an 1886 order of the County Court, overlaps both the Mineral Springs and Saratoga Districts. It gets the property taxes from the Negroes living in its territory and the taxes of the white persons are paid to the other districts.

Mineral Springs School District, which has an enrollment of about 260 students, said in its answer to the lawsuit that it "will abide by any order the Court deems advisable relative to the consolidation of Howard County Training School District, into Mineral Springs School District." It said if consolidation is accepted by the Court, it would offer a freedom of choice desegregation plan for Court approval.

The Howard County Training School said that it approved the consolidation plans and will not object to a plan of freedom of choice for the students involved that is satisfactory to the courts. It also asked that "steps be taken to assure representation for the Howard County Training School on the consolidated board."

The Howard County Training School has an enrollment that overlaps the Mineral Springs District and the other half live in the area served by the Saratoga District.

The Saratoga District had an enrollment of 217 students during the past school year - 176 white students from both Howard and Hempstead Counties and 41 Negroes from Hempstead County.

Both the Mineral Springs and Howard County Training School Districts said in their responses that they were willing to have Saratoga consolidate with them, but Saratoga was silent on consolidation in its response.

Saratoga asked that the lawsuit be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Saratoga said that it interpreted the Justice Department could only take court action to achieve desegregation upon the 360 pupils. About half of them live in the area that overlaps the Mineral Springs District and the other half

live in the Saratoga District.

The Justice Department filed its action as an intervention in the Nashville - Childress School desegregation case which had been filed by patrons of the Childress District. The all-white Nashville District and the all-Negro Childress District agreed to consolidate and that part of the case previously had been dismissed.

The two districts served generally the same territory around the Nashville District - with the Nashville District getting the property taxes of white persons and the Childress District the property taxes of Negroes. The Childress District like the Howard County Training School District, was created 80 years ago by order of the County Court.

The Mineral Springs and Howard County Training Schools filed their answers without legal representation. Saratoga engaged the services of Attorney Herschel H. Friday, Jr., of Little Rock.¹

The early court decision.---The complete text of the court decision is given below. This text is bound in Civil Action No. 962.²

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

TEXARKANA DIVISION

CHARLES MCGHEE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by
NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United
States,

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 962

¹ "Three School Districts Face Desegregation," Nashville News
June 10, 1966, p. 1.

² U. S. District Court Order, Op. cit.

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

THE NASHVILLE SPECIAL SCHOOL
DISTRICT NO. 1, a public body
corporate, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

In accordance with the statement of Facts and Conclusions of Law, it is, by consent of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1, Elbert Thomas Moody, Superintendent of the aforesaid school district, Gene Arrington, Sim Ellis, Maxie D. Blackwell, Bobby Steel, members of the Board of aforesaid school district, Childress School District No. 39, Tommy Lee Walton, Superintendent of said school district, Robert Coulter, President of the Board of said school district, Logan Coulter, Jesse Hickerson, V. L. Atkins, Tom McGee, members of the Board of said school district, Charles McGhee, et al., and the United States of America, hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, DECLARED, AND DECREED that:

1. The existence of the Childress School District No. 39 as a separate school district for Negroes, overlapping the geographic bounds of the Nashville School District No. 1, is in violation of the laws and Constitution of the United States. Its creation by court order in 1886 is declared null and void and to have no force and effect after June 30, 1966. From and after June 30, 1966, all assets and liabilities of the Childress School District No. 39 will be assumed and administered by Nashville School District No. 1.

2. The Nashville School District No. 1 shall, upon consolidation with Childress School District No. 39, commence to operate an integrated school system without regard to race or color and shall provide equal educational opportunities to all school children within the bounds of the Nashville District without regard to race or color.

3. In effectuating the provisions of this decree, the defendants Nashville School District No. 1, its Board members Gene Arrington, Sim Ellis, Bobby Steel, Maxie D. Blackwell, its President Barney B. Smith, and its Superintendent Elbert Thomas Moody, their agents, officers, employees and successors, shall proceed to execute the Plan for Desegregation of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1 and the Childress School District No. 39, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

4. Nothing in this decree shall prejudice any right or cause of action of the plaintiffs in this cause, Charles McGhee, et al., of the United States of America, plaintiff-intervenor in this cause, or of school children within Howard County, Arkansas, against any of the defendants in this cause other than the Nashville Special School District No. 1, Childress School District No. 39, and their respective board members, president, and superintendent. The court retains jurisdiction of this cause for such other appropriate orders as may be necessary.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

COURT-suggested plans for implementation.--The complete plan for desegregation of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1 and the Childress, Arkansas School District No. 39 is shown below in its entirety.¹

PLAN FOR DESEGREGATION OF THE NASHVILLE, ARKANSAS
SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1 AND THE
CHILDRESS, ARKANSAS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39

1. Grades

All grades of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1 (hereafter Nashville) and Childress, Arkansas School District No. 39 (hereafter Childress), as consolidated, shall be desegregated by fall of 1967.

(a) 1966. Commencing with the school term in September, 1966, Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the consolidated Nashville and Childress Districts shall be desegregated and pupils assigned, without regard to race or color, on a freedom of choice basis as described in this Plan.

(b) 1967. Commencing with the school term in September, 1967, the remaining grades, specifically Grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the consolidated Nashville and Childress Districts shall be desegregated and pupils assigned, without regard to race or color, on a freedom of choice basis as described in this Plan.

¹
U. S. District Court for the Western Division of Arkansas, Texakana Division. Plan for Desegregation of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District, No. 1 and the Childress, Arkansas School District, No. 39. Civil Action No. 962, 1966.

II. Unified School System - New Construction

It is the intention of the Nashville School District to propose to the voters of the district and, subject to their approval, to construct for completion by fall, 1967, a new high school facility for the consolidated Nashville Childress District. Upon completion, the new facility will accommodate all high school students (grades 9-12) in the consolidated districts. The present Nashville High School facility will be converted to use as a facility for grades 7 and 8, and will accommodate all seventh and eighth grade students in the consolidated districts. The present Nashville Junior High School facility will be converted to use for elementary grades, and together with the present Nashville Elementary School facility will accommodate all elementary students in the consolidated districts. The present facilities heretofore of the Childress District will be used for regular educational purposes for Grades 1-8 except for such grades for which less than a minimum of 15 students have applied under freedom of choice. In that event use of the Childress facilities for such grade will be discontinued.

III. Operation of the Freedom of Choice Plan

The following requirements shall apply for all students covered by freedom of choice under this Plan until the time when the school system is unified, thus eliminating the need for choice.

(a) Who May Exercise Choice: A choice of schools may be exercised by a parent or other adult person serving as the student's parent. A student may exercise his own choice if he 1) is exercising

a choice for the ninth or a higher grade, or 2) has reached the age of fifteen at the time of the exercise of choice. Such a choice by a student is controlling unless a different choice is exercised for him by his parent or other adult person serving as his parent during the choice period or at such later time as the student exercises a choice. Each reference in this Plan to a student exercising a choice means the exercise of the choice, as appropriate, by a parent or such other adult or by the student himself.

(b) Annual Exercise of Choice: Each student is required to exercise a free choice of schools annually.

(c) Choice Period: The period for exercising choice will commence on April 1 and end on April 13, preceding the school year for which choice is to be exercised. No student or prospective student who exercises his choice within the choice period shall be given any preference because of the time within the period when such choice was exercised.

(d) Mandatory Exercise of Choice: A failure to exercise a choice within the choice period does not preclude any student from exercising a choice at any time before he commences school for the year with respect to which the choice applies, but such choice may be subordinated to the choices of students who exercised choice before the expiration of the choice period. Any student who has not exercised his choice of school within a week after school opens will be assigned to the school nearest his home where space is available, under standards for determining available space which will be applied

uniformly throughout the system.

(e) Distribution of Explanatory Notice and Choice Form: On the date the choice period opens, an explanatory notice and a choice form (Appendices A and B) will be sent home with each child in the Nashville and Childress Districts. Extra copies of the explanatory notice and the choice form will be freely available to parents, students, prospective students, and the general public at every school in the Nashville and Childress districts and at the offices of the Superintendents.

(f) Return of Choice Form: At the option of the person completing the choice form, the choice form may be returned by mail, in person, or by messenger, to the principal of any school in the Nashville and Childress Districts or to the office of the Superintendents.

(g) Choices Not on Official Form: The exercise of choice may also be made by the submission in like manner of any other writing which contains information sufficient to identify the student and indicates that he has made a choice of a school.

(h) Choice Forms Binding: Once a choice form has been submitted it is binding for the entire school year, and may not be changed except in cases meeting the conditions set forth in Paragraph III (a) of this Plan and in cases of compelling hardship.

(i) Preferences in Assignment: In assigning students to schools, no preference will be given to any student for prior attendance at a school, and no choice will be denied for any reason other than overcrowding. Standards for determining overcrowding and available space

will be applied uniformly throughout the consolidated system if any choice is to be denied for such reasons. In case of overcrowding at any school, preference will be given on the basis of the proximity of the school to the homes of students choosing it, without regard to race or color.

(j) Transportation: Buses will be routed to the maximum extent feasible so as to serve each student choosing any school in the consolidated system. In any event, every student choosing the school nearest his residence will be transported to the school to which he is assigned, whether or not it is his first choice, if that school is sufficiently distant from his home to make him eligible for transportation.

(k) Officials Not to Influence Choice: No official, teacher, or employee of the Nashville or Childress Districts shall require or request any student to submit a choice form during the choice period other than by the explanatory notice and the choice form. After the expiration of the choice period, the Nashville and Childress School Systems will make all reasonable efforts to obtain a completed choice form from each student who has not exercised a choice. However, at no time shall any official, teacher, or employee of the school systems influence any parent, or other adult person serving as a parent, or any student, in the exercise of a choice, or favor or penalize any person because of a choice made. Information concerning individual choices made or schools to which individual students are assigned will not be made public.

(1) Transfers: Students in nondesegregated grades of the consolidated Nashville and Childress Districts will have an absolute right to transfer to any school in the consolidated system which has a more extensive curriculum or which offers any course of instruction, academic, athletic or otherwise, from which the student has been excluded because of his race or color.

IV. Faculty and Staff

(a) New Assignments. Race or color will henceforth not be a factor in the hiring, assignment, reassignment, promotion, demotion or dismissal of teachers and other professional staff, with the exception that assignments will be made to further the process of desegregation. Affirmative steps will be taken for the 1966-1967 school year so that there will be desegregation of the teaching and professional staff in all schools in the consolidated Nashville and Childress Districts.

(b) Dismissals. Teachers and other professional staff will not be dismissed, demoted, or passed over for retention, promotion, or rehiring on the ground of race or color. If consolidation of the Nashville and Childress Districts and the unification of the schools result in a surplus of teachers, or if any other reason related to desegregation it becomes necessary to dismiss or pass over teachers for retention, a teacher will be dismissed or passed over only upon a determination that his qualifications are inferior as compared with all other teachers in the consolidated system.

V. Services, Facilities, Activities and Programs

Once assigned to a school, a student shall have full access to and benefits of all services, facilities, activities and programs of the school to which he is assigned without discrimination based on race or color, and without regard to previous school assignment based on race or color.

VI. Information for the Public

Information concerning this Plan will be furnished to the public, including all television and radio stations and all newspapers serving the County. Copies of this Plan will be posted at each school in the system and at the office of the Superintendent.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

NASHVILLE SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT #1:

CHILDRESS SCHOOL DISTRICT #39:

CHARLES MCGHEE, et al., Plaintiffs:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Intervenor:

Gazette Explains District 39's Plan.---The plan for the Howard County School District No. 38, Mineral Springs, and Saratoga School Districts is explained in detail in an article that appeared in a June issue of the Texarkana Gazette:

Mineral Springs, Saratoga and Howard County Training School Districts and the government reached an agreement Monday on a plan for desegregation and submitted an order to Judge Oren E. Harris for his approval.

Judge Harris is expected to sign the order Tuesday.

The order abolishes the Howard County Training District (a Negro district), but not its facilities. The facilities of the Howard County Training District are to be administered by the Saratoga School District since the physical plant serving the Howard County Training District lies within the present geographical boundaries of the Saratoga District.

Mineral Springs and Saratoga School Districts are to begin operating their school systems on a desegregated basis.

The agreement was reached following a lengthy session Monday in Arkansas Federal Court.

The plan for desegregation, approved by all parties calls for all grades to be desegregated by the fall of 1967 on a freedom of choice basis. Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11 and 12 in the Saratoga District and grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 11 and 12 in the Mineral Springs District and Howard County Training School are to be desegregated beginning in September of this year. The remaining grades are to be desegregated by September, 1967.

School officials from the three school districts were on hand for the court proceeding Monday. The Saratoga District is represented by Attorney Herschel Friday of Little Rock, the Minney Boyd Tackett of Texarkana, and the Howard County Training District by Attorney Christopher Mercer of Little Rock. U. S. Attorney Charles Conway and Michael Foster of the government.¹

The emergence of controversial issues in local implementations.---

It was discouraging as well as enlightening to witness the numerous conflicts within the Negro community, within the white community and within the Negro and white communities of the county as the full impact of the final court decisions fell upon the citizenry.

Soon after the initial suit was filed, and before it reached the courts, the impact of the court decision could be felt. Naturally, some felt this impact more than others. A local minister, plaintiff,

¹"Howard County Schools Work Out Plan for Desegregation," Texarkana Gazette, June 11, 1966, p. 1.

and father of several students in the Childress School, whose income was based on the salary paid him by an associated white church of the city, was literally cut-off.

A teacher was accused of having taken part in the suit and therefore expected pressure and possible attempts to displace him.

A local auto mechanic was intimidated and thus feels insecure on his job.

Problems also grew within the Negro group. Many of the Negroes were primarily concerned with improving the educational opportunities for the children of Howard County, while others were only concerned with the dissolvment of the school district, the "throwing out" of the Negro Board, the abandoning of the school, and possibly the dismissal of some faculty members. The differences in opinion caused other controversial issues to arise within the Negro community.

Early in April, Choice Forms were distributed to all elementary and pre-school students of the Nashville and Childress School Districts with the exception of grade six, since these students would not be affected in the 1966-1967 implementations.

The results of this survey pointed out that the elementary pupils from Childress desired attendance in the Nashville Elementary School and all Nashville Elementary School students desired to continue in the same school.

Fear of personal persecution by employers was evident when Choice Forms returned by Negro parents were reviewed. It was obvious that many parents chose Childress only from direction by or from hinted intimidative action by their employers.

Is it justifiable to condemn an individual or a group of citizens simply because they ask for the things which are rightfully theirs?

Current implementation.--Current implementation of the accepted desegregation plans in Howard County has stimulated other important occurrences and has directly affected the Negro teachers of this county.

1. Across the nation, there have been dozens of examples of litigation. Court decisions (sometimes contradictory), changing regulations governing qualifications for receiving federal funds, and impending changes in employment and dismissal practices have created tensions and fears in school personnel. Many of the problems that have been referred to the National Education Association fall into the following categories:

1. Dismissal, demotion, or punishment of a teacher or administrator because of his involvement in a civil rights or desegregation conflict.
2. Teachers' lack of professional resources to defend themselves against intimidation related to desegregation.
3. An individual professional's lack of money needed to secure additional training in subject areas, methods, and inter-group relations.
4. An individual educator's lack of information regarding opportunities available to him for scholarships for re-training needed to teach other subjects or different pupils, for allied occupations, or for certification in other communities.
5. A certified, tenured Negro teacher's claim to a position which has been filled by a noncertified teacher on an emergency basis.
6. Situations where teachers and administrators have been forced by harassment to seek positions elsewhere.

7. Failure to consider graduates of teacher education colleges for employment in the towns where they choose to live.
8. An individual educator's need for more education to continue to be qualified for his position or to achieve qualification for a new assignment.¹

2. Due to the number of Negro students desiring to transfer from the Negro Schools, the teacher-pupil ratio became unbalanced to the point that more teachers were employed than required for the number of students remaining. The Nashville School District used this criterion as justification for decreasing the number of teachers that were presently employed by the Childress School District.

Report of desegregation' impact on Nashville.--A current edition of the "Nashville News" describes this phase of the implementation:

School faculties next fall will be little changed in Nashville.

All contracts have been renewed with teachers in the present Nashville System, the board revealed in session Monday night. All but three teachers have been rehired at the Childress School, which is consolidated with Nashville now.

Twelve of 15 have been rehired at Childress, including Mrs. Jessie L. Conner, Mrs. Bertha Crumpton, Claud E. King, Jr., Mrs. Hottie Piggee, Mrs. Earl J. Scoggins, Miss Cardie Bradley, Prentin Counts, Earl C. Dilworth, Mrs. Ozie Moore, Mrs. Fern Scoggins, Mrs. Earnestine Walton and the principal, Tom Walton.

Not rehired are Major White, Pollyana Wyatt and Mrs. Eddie Boyskins.

Integration of the first six grades, with freedom of choice for all students, will have some effect on faculty

¹
National Education Association, Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Southern States, A report prepared by the National Commission of Professional Rights and Responsibilities (Washington: National Education Association, December, 1966), p. 19.

and assignments in the fall, but the school board proposes to continue operation of all 12 grades at Childress, assuming probable overcrowding of the Nashville facility.

Monday night the board moved to make an early appointment with the architectural firm of Ginnochio, Cromwell, Garter and Neyland, Inc. The board has contracted for six per cent of construction costs, for the firm to draw plans for a new high school building, if voters approve a tax millage in the fall.

The board Monday discussed a building with 45,980 square feet to care for 360 students with 15 teaching stations and six classrooms. In a previous board meeting, the directors established a 6-3-3 classroom basis for the future. The new high school building would house the 10, 11 and 12 grades. The present high school would house the 7, 8, and 9 and the elementary grades would be in the present elementary and junior high buildings.

The board recently refused a petition for a blanket request for all Childress students to enter Nashville schools for the first through sixth as well as seventh through twelfth grades. The petition was denied on the grounds it was an improper request in view of a court order to consolidate and to integrate over two years.

One Childress teacher, Major White, appeared Monday to ask why he was not rehired to teach social studies at the Childress School. The board advised that he had failed to provide a transcript to the Superintendent's Office within the proper deadline. Failure to provide the transcript automatically eliminated him from the faculty, the directors voted.

Walton will continue as principal of the Childress School, the board decided.

Attending the Monday meeting were President Barney B. Smith, Gene Arrington, Sim Ellis, Bobby Steel and Superintendent Moody.¹

The three teachers, described above as being dismissed were all residents of other areas; however, M. Reynolds White, social studies

¹ "Teachers Hired for 1966-1967 Term," Nashville News, June 12, 1966, p. 1.

teacher in the Childress High School for several years, is a resident of an adjacent community. Mrs. Polyanna Wyatt was employed with the Childress School District as a remedial teacher, under Title I.

Eddie Jean Boykins was a teacher of grade 4 and resided in Longview, Texas, approximately 120 miles from Nashville and worked under an emergency certificate.

Impending suits and the help of professional organizations.--M.

Reynolds White voiced dissatisfaction to the Nashville Board and to the Superintendent of the Childress School and has threatened to sue the Nashville School District for his position in the Childress High School. It was not possible to follow the developments in this case since proceedings have not begun. Other suits are very likely to be placed and, perhaps, will become evident at a later date.

Some confidence is given to the parties mentioned above by the Arkansas Teachers Association and the National Education Association in that they provide:

1. Counseling and guidance in maintaining legal rights
2. Information about in-service programs and other opportunities to develop intergroup relations skills
3. Advice and assistance in identifying specific individual needs for further education
4. Advice about how to obtain financial assistance needed for further education
5. Placement information for those who wish to locate in other communities or states
6. Assistance and counsel for local education associations and school systems regarding problems of desegregation and integration
7. Financial assistance for legal fees and subsistence to

litigants in cases which affect the rights of the profession

8. Other services needed by persons with legitimate problems growing directly out of the desegregation and integration of schools

Desegregation of administrative structure.---The administrators of the Negro school districts were not affected by the desegregation plan to any great extent. The superintendent of the Childress School District was employed as principal for the Childress Elementary and High School. The status of the superintendent of the Howard County Training School is not known at this time; however, it is the opinion of the writer that he will be maintained as principal of the Howard County Training School. As pointed out previously, the boards of the two respective Negro school districts were completely abolished by the consolidation.

A programmed look into integration.---Orientation in education implies adjustment and the development of perspective. Few special efforts were needed for it until a few years ago when students began to come to high school with a variety of backgrounds.

Where integration is anticipated, it is important to make efforts to assist students in their transition to desegregation.

Well drawn plans focused toward orientating the Negro students for the transition have been made and are presently being implemented on the campuses of the two Negro school districts.

Remedial reading programs are being sponsored along with the Head Start Program. The remedial programs are providing special training for elementary students who made inadequate scores on survey tests

given by the coordinators, Mr. Earl C. Dilworth and Mrs. M. V. Coulter. The Federal Government is financing the programs.

The school districts hope to make some progress in closing the reading level gap between the Negro students and the white students with whom they must compete in the fall of 1966.

Summary.---The problem of school desegregation emerged from the realization that Negro pupils were being denied the freedom of opportunity for sound educational programs. The lag in pupil achievement ultimately jeopardizes the Negro child and tends to limit his potentials to compete in the "greater society."

It is hoped that the presentation of the data gives an honest and accurate description of the events and practices, as they occurred during the transitional period from segregated to integrated patterns of the Negro school districts in Howard County, Arkansas.

A more detailed summary of the facts will be presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Recapitulation of the Theoretical Basis of the Study

Frame-of-reference.---Across the nation, there have been numerous examples of district consolidation, school desegregation and other practices bearing upon solutions to the problems that are presently being revealed by citizens who have been deprived of their rights for so many years.

The segregated school district is a demon that must be cut free from the solid roots that she has so deeply implanted at the expense of thousands of Negro boys and girls.

School districts which tend to pattern and practice segregation are varied in structure and type. The traditional type school district is often discussed in professional meetings but little general knowledge is usually shown of the separate Negro school districts. The existence of Negro school districts are not common, but do exist.

Attention, in recent years, has been directed, by Negroes and fair-minded citizens, toward providing improved learning opportunities for all children. Many districts have been consolidated; and previously segregated schools are now desegregated. Various approaches as to the implementation of school desegregation have been made and,

for the most part, much valuable time has been squandered due to the uncertainty of definite procedural techniques as well as the climate of resistance to change in the educational enterprise.

By tracing the course and development of the separate Negro school districts of Howard County, Arkansas, to a single, integrated system, the writer has hoped that the presentation of these findings of this research will be of utmost value to those presently confronted with this controversial problem.

The writer's interest in this problem stemmed from the outgrowth of an increased awareness of the importance of sound educational opportunities for the Negro youth in Howard County, Arkansas and the nation. Too long have the segregated schools denied the Negro boy and girl the type of education so vitally necessary for their survival in the new competitive era, and too wide has been the gap between where this child ought to be and where he actually is.

It is hoped by the writer, that this presentation has pointed out the significance of school district reorganization and illustrated the kind and quality of leadership so particularly important in providing continuous improvement of the education enterprise and the societal structure and processes in the new democratic society of our times.

The major problem involved in this study was: To trace the course and development of the two Negro school districts in Howard County, Arkansas during transition to single and integrated school districts, in each situation, as prompted by the 1964 Civil Rights Act and following civil rights legislation.

The purpose of this study was to give a portrayal of the administrative and community problems and approaches used in converting two former separate Negro school districts into single, integrated school districts as dictated by the Federal Government.

Recapitulation of the Research-Design

The more important aspects of the research-design of this study are outlined below.

1. Locale of Study - The greater part of this study was undertaken in Nashville, Howard County, Arkansas. Nashville, the County Seat, is situated in the southwest section of Arkansas and occupies a total of 253 square miles against 1,063 square miles for the entire county. The population of the county is 10,878 including 2,260 Negroes. The total number of students enumerated in 1964 was 2,752. Negroes constitute approximately 28 per cent of this figure. Students are distributed throughout six school districts.
2. Methods of Educational Research - A study of this type involved a combination of methods. Explicit indications of the types used are listed below:
 - (a) Historical Methodology (including tracing of the legal development)
 - (b) Descriptive-Survey
 1. School surveys
 2. Community surveys
 3. Interviews
 - (c) Evaluative Method

These methods were used in this study utilizing the specific techniques of documentary analysis, content, analysis and external-internal criticism.

3. Materials - Materials used in this study as sources of data were:

- (a) Books (references in educational administration, both old and new)
 - (b) Current administrative and educational periodicals, reports and journals.
 - (c) Arkansas State and County school records
 - (d) Federal court briefs and orders from the Federal Office of Health, Education and Welfare
 - (e) Tables and graphs
 - (f) Maps of Howard County, Arkansas and surrounding territory
 - (g) A wide variety of newspaper articles
4. Instruments - The following instruments were utilized in this study:
- (a) Questionnaires for determining opinions of local residents concerning specific patterns of the Negro school districts
 - (b) Surveys to establish background facts
 - (c) Interviews to determine the methods of procedure used in the integrating process
5. Criterion of Reliability - The criterion of the reliability of the data collected was based upon:
- (a) Internal and external criticism of experts
 - (b) The accuracy and objectivity of the evaluation of the writer
6. Procedural Steps - The steps used in this study were:
- (a) Gaining permission from the proper authorities; that is, the school districts involved, the county school officials, the attorney for the Plaintiffs, and the Federal attorney for the Western Division of Arkansas.
 - (b) Reviewing the related literature pertinent to the problem.
 - (c) Reviewing the significant aspects of pertinent background information and problems relative to the study.
 - (d) Making a survey of the involved schools as to the factors of programs, arrangements, personnel and finance.

- (e) Analyzing and interpreting the decisions rendered by the courts.
- (f) Reviewing and interpreting the plans and progress for the integrating of the respective school districts, as stimulated by the court decisions.
- (g) Conducting an opinion poll among the citizens of each of the districts which constitute the locale of the study.
- (h) Assembling appropriate tables and graphs.
- (i) Incorporating the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations in the finished thesis copy.

Summary of Related Literature

The review of the literature pertinent to this study was divided into such areas as:

1. Historical background
2. Patterns of Segregated School Districts
3. Impact of the 1964 Civil Rights Act
4. Initial Suit
5. Court Decisions
6. Current Implementation

The summary of the related literature indicates the following points:

Historical background

1. The Negro school districts were created in 1886, by order of the Howard County Court, Howard County, Arkansas.
2. The Negro citizenry elected the first board in 1886. All were Negroes.
3. Separate tax books were set up in Howard County, Arkansas for Negro and white residents, for purposes of education.

Patterns of Segregated School Districts

1. Inadequate facilities were common in the separate Negro school districts.
2. The instructional staff was generally under-paid and school terms were often filled with transfers and resignations.
3. The earliest curriculum in this county were simple and over-emphasized agriculture and home economics.
4. Federal programs were instrumental in the meager success of the Negro school districts in providing some improvement through the years.

Impact of the 1964 Civil Rights Act

1. The Negro citizenry became insistent upon local compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.
2. The districts, determined to maintain a segregated status, made "paper" compliance, only, to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Initial Suit

1. Negro citizens and parents brought forth suits focused toward the consolidation of school districts and the desegregation of schools over the nation.
2. The Attorney General's office intervened once the case was reviewed and found to be of major importance.

Court Decisions

1. Courts, in general, ruled in favor of the Negro plaintiffs when the facts were established that the white schools had not initiated proposed desegregation plans.
2. Most court decisions dictated immediate desegregation of public schools and facilities with dead-line dates within two years.

Current Implementation

1. Additional plants and school facilities are necessary factors in the implementation of school desegregation.
2. Some measures are intended and are necessary for orientating Negro pupils who are occasioned by school desegregation.

Summary of the Basic Findings

The summary of the basic findings has been divided into five periods, each of which was marked by significant patterns and changes in and on the educational program for Negroes in Howard County, Arkansas. The five periods are inclusive of the sequence of time and events from 1886-1966. The periods are as follows:

1. The Historical Period
2. The Intermediate Period
3. The Initial Suit Period
4. The Period of Decision and Transition
5. The Implementation Period

The Historical Period

1. The purpose for the creation of the Negro school districts in Howard County, Arkansas was to provide separate educational facilities for children of the Negro race.
2. The geographical boundaries of the Negro school districts and the pre-existing school districts were substantially the same.
3. The Howard County Court, Howard County, Arkansas ordered the creation of the Negro school districts on July 5, 1886 and August 10, 1886, respectively.
4. All Negro boards were elected and charged with the powers to administer, control and supervise all matters pertaining to the Negro school districts.
5. The white school districts levied and collected taxes from white property owners and the Negro school districts levied and collected taxes from the Negro property owners in their jointly covered area.

The Intermediate Period

1. Since the creation of the Negro school districts in 1886, the Negro school districts have enrolled Negro but not white school children and the white school districts have

enrolled white but not Negro school children residing in the same area.

2. Valuation of the property of the white property owners within the concentrated areas exceeded that of the Negro property owners by a ratio of 14 to 1.
3. The facilities and education provided Negro children were substantially inferior to the facilities and education provided white children.

The Initial Suit

1. Dissatisfaction with gerrymander practices grew in severity among the Negro residents thus initiated efforts to seek relief through the federal courts.
2. The plaintiffs, on December 20, 1965, filed their complaint seeking a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against alleged conduct of the white and Negro school districts denying them the equal protection of the laws on account of race or color, in violation of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
3. The plaintiffs were Negro citizens of the United States who presently reside in Howard County and are parents of Negro children attending school in the Negro school districts.
4. The Attorney General certified that this case was of general importance and therefore saw the necessity to intervene.
5. Once the initial suit had been initiated, the Office of Education took special interest in the case and intervened when it appeared necessary.
6. The Complaint in Intervention brought in Districts No. 38, 11 and 3, that had not been challenged in the courts.

The Period of Decision and Transition

1. The court decisions were based on negligence of school districts to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights and added guidelines.
2. The defendants were receiving financial aid and assistance under various federal programs administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

3. The districts had agreed in writing that they would not consider the race or color of pupils in their enrollment, assignment or transfer. One district (The Saratoga School District No. 11) filed a voluntary desegregation plan with the United States Office of Education but never applied its plan to Negro school children living in the geographical area jointly covered by the said school district and the Negro school district.
4. The manner in which the school systems operated violated Articles 601-602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in that Negro citizens were excluded from participation in, denied benefits of, and subjected to discrimination because of their race or color under programs receiving federal funds.
5. The court entered an order enjoining the defendants, their agents, officers, employees, successors, and all those who were in active concert or participation with them from maintaining dual school systems based upon race or color; from failing to provide equal educational opportunities to all students in the same geographic area without regard to the students' race or color; and from otherwise maintaining in the operation of the public schools over which the defendants have jurisdiction any distinctions based upon race or color.
6. The court ordered, adjudged, declared and decreed that:
 - (a) The existence of the Negro school districts as separate school districts for Negroes, overlapping the geographic bounds of the white school districts were in violation of the laws and Constitution of the United States. Their creation by court order in 1886 was declared null and void and will have no force and effect after June 30, 1966. From and after June 30, 1966 all assets and liabilities of the Negro school districts will be assumed and administered by the Nashville School District No. 1 and the Saratoga School District No. 11, respectively.
 - (b) The Nashville School District No. 1 and the Saratoga School District No. 11 upon consolidation with Childress School District No. 39 and the Howard County Training School District No. 38 was ordered to commence to operate an integrated school system without regard to race or color and to provide equal educational opportunities to all school children within the bounds of the Nashville District without regard to race or color.
 - (c) The white school districts were ordered to proceed to execute the Plans for Desegregation.

- (d) The court also ordered that this process would not prejudice any right or cause of action of the plaintiffs in the cause nor their respective board members, president and superintendent.

The Implementation Period

1. Plans for desegregation was submitted and accepted. The plans included: desegregation of all schools by fall of 1967, constructing a new high school facility for the consolidated district, operating a Freedom of Choice Plan, transporting all students in the consolidated area, receiving transfers from any student who transfers to select courses of instruction, academic, athletic or otherwise which are not offered in the previously attended school.

The plans included measures that prohibited hiring, assignment, reassignment, promotion, demotion, or dismissal of teachers and other professional staff, based on race or color.

2. Implementation of the desegregation plan caused the emergence of various problems within the communities. Problems ranged from the intimidation of lay personnel involved in the suit, dismissal of teachers due to loss of students, to general conflicts between citizens of the communities.
3. Summer programs of remediation were necessary to orient and prepare Negro students for the problems and challenges occasioned by school desegregation.

Conclusions

1. The top administrative function, structure, and personnel in the segregated Negro school districts were identical to these facets of the administrative activity in the typical white school districts.
2. The fiscal structure with its highly restricted tax evaluation and millage ratio constituted a highly inhibiting influence upon the maintenance of the segregated and separate educational enterprise in Howard County, Arkansas.
3. The coming of the 1964 Civil Rights Act followed by the upsurge of Negro insistence upon its implementation which in turn, followed by court suits, brought on by indignant Negro citizens, marked the path of the emergence of the plans and programs for the desegregating of the school districts in Howard County, Arkansas.

4. The birth of an enlightened social intelligence and sensitive social conscience of the American people in the last half of the twentieth century provoked renewed and determined efforts to bring democracy to its fullest fruition in American life. Hence, it was this new social conscience that brought on the program for school desegregation in all of its aspects.
5. The heightened knowledgeableness and full articulateness about the educational enterprise on a part of the Negro citizenry brought the problem of desegregation into the courts as well as provoked social conflict among and between the white and Negro citizenry in those communities with separate school facilities based on race.
6. The heightened or renewed racial antagonisms characterized by such factors as:
 - (a) The imposition of economic sanctions upon the Negro worker.
 - (b) The mixed fears of Negro citizens for life and property; the apprehension of Negro educational personnel for either loss of job or down-grading of job or both; together with severe restrictions of fiscal support to school districts all are the fruits of court decisions to desegregate schools and the implementation of guidelines for that desegregation.
 - (c) The readjustment of the number of educational personnel, the reassigning of educational personnel, the reassignment of student personnel and the utilization of school plant facilities are the major problems of the educational enterprise provoked by the final court decisions which pertained to desegregation in Howard County, Arkansas.

Implications

1. The fostering of equality in educational opportunities for Negro children and youth in Howard County, Arkansas had to await the awakening social intelligences and social conscience of the white citizenry stimulated by legislative enactment and court decisions.
2. There is an inexplicable reservoir of feeling of racial inferiority and superiority held by a substantial segment of the white citizenry of America; for how else can be explained the overt and covert resistance to desegregation in the south and de facto segregation in the north.

Recommendations

1. The need for all Americans to come honestly to grips with the problem of racial segregation in all of its manifestations and ramifications in the social economic pattern of the nation.
2. The need for developing clear-cut but justifiable procedures for implementing the program of desegregation.
3. The need for developing clear realization, by Americans, that school segregation and social cleavages are primarily functions of segregation in the residential areas where Americans live.
4. The need for added emphasis on the legal and financial assistance to be offered the Negro educational personnel in cases of unavoidable displacement.
5. The need for effective guidance personnel to assist the members of the Negro citizenry as they attempt to break through the color barriers in the public schools throughout the nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bond, Horace Mann. The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934.
- Bond Horace Mann. Negro Education in Alabama. Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939.
- Ford, A. W. The School Laws of Arkansas. Little Rock, Arkansas: State Department of Education, 1962.
- Good, Carter V. (ed.) A Dictionary of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Good, Carter V., Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Hockett, Homer Carey. The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing. 1st Edition, New York: The McMillan Co., 1955.
- Johns, R. L., Morphit, E. L. Reller, T. L. Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Mouvly, George J. The Science of Educational Research. New York: American Book Co., 1963.
- Rivlin, H. N., and Schueler, Herbert. (ed). Encyclopedia of Modern Education. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1943.
- Whitney, Frederick L. The Elements of Research. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.
- _____. The Winston Dictionary: College Edition. Atlanta, Georgia: The John C. Winston Co., 1951.

Articles and Periodicals

- Arkansas Gazette. December 12, 1965.
- Arkansas Gazette. January 5, 1966.

Arkansas Gazette. June 7, 1966.

Bond, Horace Mann. "The Extent and Character of Separate Schools in the United States," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), 321.

Hickerson, Nathaniel. "Physical Integration Alone is Not Enough," The Journal of Negro Education, XXV (Spring, 1966), 110.

Nashville News. December 21, 1965.

Nashville News. March 29, 1966.

Nashville News. June 10, 1966.

Nashville News. June 12, 1966.

Rice, Arthur H. "Federal Guidelines Actually Control Public School Policy," Nations Schools, LXXVII, No. 6 (June, 1966), 10-104.

Seeley, David S. "Seeley Responds: Local Failures Forced the Guidelines," Nations Schools, LXXVII, No. 6 (June, 1966), 11-104.

Texarkana Gazette. June 11, 1966.

Thompson, Charles H. "Profiles of Education," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), 289.

Williams, W. T. B. "Court Action by Negroes to Improve Their Schools a Doubtful Remedy," The Journal of Negro Education, IV (1935), 435.

Public Documents

Nashville School District. Plan for Desegregation of the Nashville, Arkansas Special School District No. 1 and the Childress, Arkansas School District No. 39. March, 1966.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Seventeenth Census of the United States: 1960 Population, XI.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. County and City Data Book. Washington: 1962.

U. S. District Court, Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division. Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint in Intervention and to Add Parties. Civil Action 962, 1966.

- U. S. District Court, Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division.
Orders. Civil Action 962, 1966.
- U. S. District Court, Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division.
Statement of Facts and Conclusions of Law, Civil Action 962, 1966.
- U. S. District Court, Western District of Arkansas, Texarkana Division.
Stipulation of Facts. Civil Action 962, 1966.

Reports

- Howard County School Supervisors Office. Principal's Annual Report, Howard County Public Schools. Nashville, Arkansas: 1965-1966.
- National Education Association. Task Force Survey of Teacher Displacement in Seventeen States. Washington, D. C.: December, 1965.
- State Department of Education. Report on House Concurrent Resolution No. 58 of 1961 General Assembly. Little Rock: January, 1966.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Profile of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington: 1966.

Other Sources

- _____. Personal Interview with Winfred Clardy, Supervisor, Howard County Public Schools, Nashville, Arkansas, April, 1966.
- _____. Personal Interview with Charles M. Conway, United States Attorney, United States Department of Justice, Western Division, Fort Smith, Arkansas. March, 1966.
- _____. Personal Interview with E. T. Moody, Superintendent, Nashville School District Number 1, Nashville, Arkansas. May, 1966.
- _____. Personal Interview with E. T. Patterson, Executive Secretary Arkansas Teachers Association, Little Rock, Arkansas. April, 1966.
- _____. Personal Interview with B. G. Williams, State Supervisor, State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas. March, 1966.
- _____. Personal Interview with John W. Walker, Attorney at Law, Attorney for the Plaintiffs, Little Rock, Arkansas. March, 1966.

_____. Personal Interview with Community at Large, Howard County, Arkansas. February, 1966 - May, 1966.

_____. Personal Interview with Dr. L. E. Boyd, Department of Education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia. July, 1966.

Unpublished Materials

Chaney, Luther L. "A Study of the Development of the Negro Public School System of Meridian, Mississippi, 1923-1953." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1954.

Richey, James D. "The Legal Status of Education for Colored People As by Court Decision," Unpublished Master's thesis, Ames: Iowa State College, 1932.

A P P E N D I X E S

APPENDIX A

Notice

The Nashville and Childress School Districts will be merged next year and Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 desegregated. Regardless of race or color, any student who will be entering one of these grades next year may choose to attend either the Nashville or the Childress Schools. A choice must be made for each child entering one of the desegregated grades.

Attached to this Notice is a choice form which must be filled out and returned on or before April 31, 1966.

Once a choice is made and the choice period has expired, the choice is binding for the next school year.

No child will be denied his choice unless for reasons of overcrowding, in which case children nearest the school will have preference.

Transportation will be provided, if possible, no matter what school is chosen.

Choice forms may be returned by mail, in person, or by messenger to the principal of any school in the Nashville or Childress Districts, or to the offices of the Superintendents.

Students in nondesegregated grades have the right to transfer, upon application, to any school in the consolidated district which

offers more extensive curriculum than the school to which the student has been assigned because of race.

APPENDIX B

CHOICE FORM

This form is provided for you to choose a school for your child to attend next year. You have 30 days to make your choice. It does not matter which school your child attended last year, or whether that school was formerly a white or Negro school.

This form must either be brought to any school principal or mailed or brought to the offices of the Superintendents of the Nashville or Childress Districts by April 31, 1966.

Name of Child _____
Last First Middle

Address _____

Name of Parent or other adult
serving as parent _____

If child is entering first grade, date of birth _____
Month Day Year

Grade pupil is entering _____

School last attended _____

If your child is entering Grade 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, choose one of the following schools by marking an X beside the name.

<u>Name of School</u>	<u>Grades</u>	<u>Location</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Signature _____

Date _____

To be filled in by Superintendent:

School Assigned

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY TABLE 5

SUMMARY DATA OF THE FISCAL SUPPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM - HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS

	Area in Square Miles	1964-65 ADA	1964 Enumera- tion	1964 Assessed Valuation	1964 MEO	Mills DS
HOWARD						
Childress	194	315	328	328,907	16	26
Dierks	232	608	639	2,045,715	26.5	13.5
Howard County Training School	148	381	363	163,910	16	24
Mineral Springs	95	247	290	994,885	23.5	21.5
Nashville	253	960	1,007	4,511,978	21	19
North Howard County	141	136	125	877,640	22	16
HEMPSTEAD						
Saratogo*	112	235	350	1,558,270	28	12
Total	1,175	2,852	3,102	10,481,305	48.8	32

*School district in Hempstead County.

SUMMARY TABLE 5--Continued

	Voted Total	1965 MEO	Mills DS	Voted Total	Local Receipts 1964-65	Estimated Local Receipts -1965-66
HOWARD						
Childress	42	16	26	42	11,606	11,500
Dierks	40	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	40	75,807	75,503
Howard County Training School	40	16	24	40	5,638	5,458
Mineral Springs	45	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	45	39,653	41,030
Nashville	40	21	19	40	158,173	171,854
North Howard County	38	32	16	48	32,598	30,844
HEMPSTEAD						
Saratogo*	40	28	12	40	55,768	55,422
Total	80.8	42.5	40	82.5	379,243	391,611

* School district in Hempstead County.

SUMMARY TABLE 5--Continued

	Transportation Aid		Vocational Aid		1964-65	1964-65
	1964-65	1965-66	1964-65	1965-66	Instruc- tional	Current Expense
HOWARD						
Childress	10,748	8,195	2,997	2,997	1,540	68,218
Dierks	15,397	15,558	1,187	1,417	1,760	152,829
Howard County Training	13,242	13,197	3,119	3,003	1,764	83,685
Mineral Springs	7,094	7,370	3,016	2,930	959	82,072
Nashville	18,300	19,451	3,412	3,232	2,903	254,463
North Howard County	5,977	6,407	-	-	435	50,248
HEMPSTEAD						
Saratogo*	5,503	5,514	-	-	1,764	72,428
Total	76,261	75,692	13,731	13,579	11,125	763,943

* School district in Hempstead County.

SUMMARY TABLE 5--Continued

	Total Paid Classroom Teachers			Average Salary Paid Classroom Teachers		
	1962-63	1964-65	1965-66	62-63	64-65	65-66
HOWARD						
Childress	42,383	43,188	54,144	3027	3085	4165
Dierks	80,605	93,497	103,880	3505	3896	4155
Howard County Training School	48,024	51,386	61,854	3002	3212	3866
Mineral Springs	49,642	52,751	56,640	3546	3768	4046
Nashville	151,424	176,301	194,128	3883	4408	4853
North Howard County	28,920	29,672	34,899	3615	3709	4362
HEMPSTEAD						
Saratogo*	49,671	52,946	58,890	4139	4073	4530
Total	450,669	499,741	564,435	3828	4216	4444

* School district in Hempstead County.

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

HOWARD COUNTY, ARKANSAS, 1966

Nashville #1

M. D. Blackwell
Gene Arrington
Bobby Steele
Sim Ellis
Barney B. Smith

Mineral Springs #3

Ellis Thompson
J. J. Bell
Richard F. Young
R. P. Graves
Thomas Bridgeman

Saratoga #1*

Roy Mobley
C. C. Fricks
Dalton Harris
Mrs. Mary Spotes Goodwin
Bryon Thompson

Howard County Training #38

Julius Owens
John L. Hendrix
Lewis Turner
C. S. Crofton
Henry J. Graves

Childress #39

Logan Coulter
Jesse Hickerson

*In Hempstead County

Childress #39

Robert Coulter
Tom McGee
Ulyses Atkins

APPENDIX E

District Reorganization and School Desegregation

Questionnaire for Parents

Please help us by answering these questions but Do Not Sign Your Name.

1. How many children do you have in the elementary grades?

Grades 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. How do you get information about your child's school?
(Check all the following items that tell how you get information)

1. Visiting the school _____
2. Going to PTA _____
3. Talking with children _____
4. Talking with adults _____
5. Reading the school newspaper, yearbook, etc. _____
6. Reading the city newspaper _____
7. Listening to the radio _____
8. Other (tell what) _____

- 3. Do you favor:**
- | | | |
|------------|-----------|----------|
| Yes | No | ? |
|------------|-----------|----------|

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Separate schools for Negroes | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Separate schools but mixed faculties | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Mixed schools and all Negro faculties | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Mixed schools and all white faculties | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Mixed schools and mixed faculties | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. One school board for the county | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Separate school boards | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Mixed school boards | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. Do you plan for your children to go to college? Yes No

5. Does your child discuss his personal and social problems with you? Yes No

6. How would you evaluate the school's program? Good ____ Fair ____
Weak ____

7. As a parent, what program would you like to see initiated?

VITA

Tommy Lee Walton

Education: B. S. Arkansas Agricultural Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, 1958. Major - Pre-Medicine - Minor - Biology; Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Arkansas, Summer, 1961; University of Missouri, School of Mines and Metallurgy, Rolla, Missouri, Summers, 1962 and 1963; Atlanta University, School of Education, Atlanta, Georgia Summers, 1964, 1965 and 1966.

Graduate Field of Concentration: Administration and Supervision.

Experience: Science instructor and basketball coach, Howard County High School, Mineral Springs, Arkansas, 1958-1959; Principal and science teacher, Childress High School, Nashville, Arkansas, 1959-1964; superintendent of the Childress School District Number 39, 1964 - present.

Professional Memberships: National Education Association, Arkansas Teachers Association, Howard County Education Association, District 3 Administrators Association, Arkansas State Administrators, and the Local Teachers Association.

Personal Information: Married to Earnestine B. Walton; two children - ages seven and five. Member of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Kappa Chi Chapter; a mason and the advisor of Local Boy Scouts of America, Troop 128.